

JPRS-TAC-92-006
14 FEBRUARY 1992



JPRS Report

Arms Control

Arms Control

JPRS-TAC-92-006

CONTENTS

14 February 1992

CHINA

U.S. Scales Down Defense Budget for FY 1993 [XINHUA 29 Jan]	1
Bush State of the Union Message Reported	1
Spells Out Arms Cuts Proposals [XINHUA 29 Jan]	1
'Deep Cuts' in Strategic Force [XINHUA 29 Jan]	1
U.S., Russian Disarmament Plans Viewed	2
Foreign Ministry Spokesman Comments [XINHUA 30 Jan]	2
Says Disarmament Plans 'Welcome' [ZHONGGUO XINWEN SHE 30 Jan]	2
Reports on Yeltsin Speech at UN Security Council	2
Calls for Arms Cuts [XINHUA 31 Jan]	2
Other States Urged To Follow [XINHUA 1 Feb]	3
Premier Addresses UN Security Council [RENMIN RIBAO OVERSEAS EDITION 3 Feb]	3

EAST ASIA

JAPAN

Foreign Minister Hails Bush Arms Cut Announcement [KYODO 29 Jan]	5
Businesses Welcome Bush's Defense Outlay Cuts [KYODO 29 Jan]	5
Prime Minister Addresses UN Security Council [KYODO 31 Jan]	5
Foreign Minister Views Bush-Yeltsin Talks [M. Watanabe et al.; Tokyo TV 2 Feb]	6

EAST EUROPE

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

CSCE Foreign Ministers Meet in Prague	8
CSFR President Havel Speaks [Prague Radio 30 Jan]	8
Ministers Hold News Conference [Prague TV 31 Jan]	9
FRG's Genscher on Proliferation [Berlin ADN 30 Jan]	10

COMMONWEALTH OF INDEPENDENT STATES

RESPONSE TO BUSH INITIATIVE

Yeltsin Delivers Statement on Disarmament [Moscow TV 29 Jan]	11
BBC Airs Interview With Yeltsin [London TV 29 Jan]	14
Bush, Yeltsin Arms Initiatives Called 'Real Breakthrough'	
[V. Kozyakov; Moscow Radio 29 Jan]	17
Baker, Kozyrev Comment on Bush, Yeltsin Speeches [INTERFAX 29 Jan]	17
Comments on Yeltsin 29 Jan Speech	18
Support From Non-Russian Republics Weighed [A. Yakovlev; TASS 30 Jan]	18
Japanese Prime Minister Cited [TASS 30 Jan]	18
State of the Union Summarized, Called 'Very Significant'	
[A. Blinov, A. Sychev; IZVESTIYA 30 Jan]	18
Further Commentaries on Yeltsin 29 Jan Initiative	19
'Real Nuclear Arms Cuts' [A. Surzhanskiy; TASS 30 Jan]	19
Speed of Yeltsin Actions Questioned [M. Chikin; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 30 Jan]	19
'Sensational,' 'Enigmatic' Proposal [M. Osokin; Moscow TV 30 Jan]	20
Contradictions in Plan Noted [A. Savelyev; IZVESTIYA 31 Jan]	20
Confusion Over Yeltsin Plan Alleged [Russian TV 30 Jan]	22
'Breakthrough' in Thinking [V. Smelov; KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 31 Jan]	22
Kazakhstan Welcomes Initiatives [INTERFAX 31 Jan]	22
Gorbachev Says 'Important Step' [TASS 30 Jan]	22

Bush Declaration of Cold War Victory Noted [V. Drobkov; PRAVDA 30 Jan]	23
Arms Initiatives in State of the Union Message Summarized [M. Feyashin; KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Jan]	24

GENERAL

U.S. Money for CIS Disarmament 'Insufficient' [IZVESTIYA 25 Jan]	24
Commentaries on Yeltsin Missile Targeting Announcement	25
Statement 'Raises Questions' [A. Karpychev; PRAVDA 29 Jan]	25
'Mixed' Western Response Seen [A. Krivopalov, A. Sychev; IZVESTIYA 29 Jan]	26
Ukraine's Kravchuk 'Not Consulted' [TASS 28 Jan]	26
SRF Explanation Cited [V. Litovkin; IZVESTIYA 28 Jan]	27
'Fundamental Change in Strategy' [A. Golts; KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Jan]	27
U.S. Welcomes Yeltsin Offer [TASS 27 Jan]	28
'Dramatic' Announcement Praised [Yu. Solton; Moscow Radio 27 Jan]	28
Yeltsin, Major Hold 'Honest, Frank Dialogue' [TASS 30 Jan]	29

NUCLEAR & SPACE ARMS TALKS

Moscow Nuclear Risk Reduction Center Profiled [V. Medvedev; RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 29 Jan]	30
--	----

START TALKS

Further on Kazakhstan SS-19 Missile Launch [V. Nadein; IZVESTIYA 23 Jan]	30
Rocket Forces in 'Constant Combat Readiness' [A. Dolinin; KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 Jan]	31
Kazakh President, French Foreign Minister Discuss START	32
Discuss Missile Withdrawal [INTERFAX 25 Jan]	32
Kazakhstan To Ratify Treaty [A. Ladin; KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Jan]	32

SDI, DEFENSE & SPACE ARMS

Pentagon Said To Push for End to ABM Treaty [V. Drobkov; PRAVDA 28 Jan]	32
Pentagon Cuts Said Not To Include SDI [A. Blinov; IZVESTIYA 28 Jan]	33

CONVENTIONAL FORCES IN EUROPE

Russian Defense Aide Urges 2-Million Man Troop Cut [Oslo AFTENPOSTEN 24 Jan]	34
WGF Chief, Mecklenburg Premier Cited on Withdrawal [V. Markushin; KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 Jan]	35
Division of Armed Forces, Paris Treaty Viewed [Moscow Radio 25 Jan]	35
Baltic Assembly Deals With Issue of Soviet Withdrawal	35
Russian Official Comments [TASS 25 Jan]	35
News Conference Held [TASS 25 Jan]	36
Interview With Latvian Official [Riga Radio 25 Jan]	36
Meet With Army Group [Vilnius Radio 25 Jan]	37
Appeal to Yeltsin [TASS 26 Jan]	37
Russia's Shakhrai To Negotiate Pullout From Estonia, Lithuania	37
To Arrive in Tallinn 2 Feb [BALTFAX 29 Jan]	37
Postpones Vilnius Visit [Vilnius Radio 29 Jan]	38
Shakhrai Arrives in Vilnius [Vilnius Radio 31 Jan]	38
Strength of Armed Forces To Drop to 2.5 Million	38
Gen Koltunov Details Cuts [INTERFAX 30 Jan]	38
30 Percent Cut by 1 July [Moscow TV 29 Jan]	38

SHORT-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

Reports on Shift of Nuclear Arms From Belarus to Russia	39
Strategic Arms To Leave by 1995 [POSTFACTUM 24 Jan]	39
First Batch of Tactical Arms Moved [TASS 26 Jan]	39
Parliamentarian Comments [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Jan]	39

CHEMICAL & BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

Russian Chemical Weapons Elimination Group Formed	[POSTFACTUM 27 Jan]	39
---	---------------------	----

REPUBLIC NUCLEAR WEAPONS ISSUES

Ukrainian Nationalists Want To Keep Nuclear Weapons	[IZVESTIYA 30 Jan]	39
---	--------------------	----

WEST EUROPE

FRANCE

Aerospatiale, Thomson-CSF Discuss Joint ABM System Development	[LES ECHOS 25 Oct]	40
--	--------------------	----

GERMANY

Kohl Remarks on Bush, Yeltsin Initiatives	[ADN 29 Jan]	40
Bundeswehr Strength To Be 'Considerably' Reduced	[FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU 29 Jan]	40
Bush's State of Union Address Discussed	[J. Joffe; SUEDEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG 30 Jan]	41

UNITED KINGDOM

Third World Threat Said to Necessitate Trident	[THE DAILY TELEGRAPH 11 Jan]	41
Russia's Yeltsin, Prime Minister Major Meet		42
Yeltsin Arrives	[PRESS ASSOCIATION 30 Jan]	42
Discusses Nuclear Reductions	[PRESS ASSOCIATION 30 Jan]	42
Sign Joint Declaration	[PRESS ASSOCIATION 30 Jan]	42
Missiles No Longer Target UK	[PRESS ASSOCIATION 30 Jan]	43
Major Delivers UN Security Council Statement	[PRESS ASSOCIATION 31 Jan]	44

U.S. Scales Down Defense Budget for FY 1993

OW2901220392 Beijing XINHUA in English
1948 GMT 29 Jan 92

[Text] Washington, January 29 (XINHUA)—The U.S. defense budget for fiscal year 1993 will be almost 10 billion dollars less than the previous year, with funding reduced or canceled for many big ticket weapon programs, the Pentagon said today.

According to figures released by the Defense Department, the budget outlays for the Pentagon and military-related programs of other federal agencies are 285.9 billion dollars, as compared with 295.2 billion dollars for fiscal 1992.

The defense budget authority for fiscal year 1993, which begins October 1, is 280.9 billion dollars, also down from the 283.8 billion dollars the year earlier. Budget outlays are the money spent in a given year while budget authority is the funding over the lifetime of a program, not all of which is spent in a given budget year.

Yesterday, President George Bush announced in his state of the union address that the United States will save up to 50 billion dollars in military spending by 1997 by stopping the production of certain weapons programs and taking further cuts in strategic forces.

Bush said that the United States will cancel the programs of Midgetman long-range missile and a new warhead for the Trident missile, purchase no more advanced cruise missiles and stop the production of B-2 Stealth bombers at 20, of which 15 has already been funded by the Congress.

According to the Pentagon, the Seawolf submarine program will also be terminated and the production of Comanche light helicopter will be postponed, along with several other weapons programs.

The Pentagon said it would seek 267.6 billion dollars in budget authority for fiscal year 1993, 9.9 billion below the previous year's budget or a seven percent decline after inflation adjustment.

Bush State of the Union Message Reported

Spells Out Arms Cuts Proposals

OW2901060592 Beijing XINHUA in English
0548 GMT 29 Jan 92

[Text] Washington, January 28 (XINHUA)—U.S. President George Bush vowed tonight to undertake further cuts in the country's strategic forces provided nations from the former Soviet Union followed suit.

In his State of Union address, Bush said he would stop B-2 Stealth bomber numbers at 20, down from the 75 planes the administration had asked for last year.

He also announced plans to cancel development of the Midgetman inter-continental ballistic missile.

The United States would stop the production of new warheads for sea-based ballistic missiles, cease the production of MX missiles and stop purchases of advanced Cruise missiles, Bush added.

And provided the former Soviet republics eliminated all land-based multiple warhead ballistic missiles, the United States would scrap all MX missiles and reduce the number of warheads on Minuteman missiles to just one, he said.

Washington would also reduce the number of warheads on sea-based missiles by around one-third and convert a substantial portion of strategic bombers to primarily conventional use, he added.

Bush said he had already informed Russian Federation President Boris Yeltsin of the U.S. initiative.

Yeltsin had given a "very positive" response and would discuss the matter in detail at Saturday's Camp David summit meeting, Bush said.

The planned reductions would save up to 50 billion U.S. dollars over the next five years and when added to reductions announced over the past two years would represent a 30 percent cut in America's military budget between 1989 and 1997, Bush said.

"These cuts are deep, and you must know my resolve: This deep, and no deeper", he said.

This was an apparent rebuke to calls by democrats for deeper cuts in Pentagon expenditure.

Arguing that high military spending was no longer needed in the post-cold war era, Senate majority leader George Mitchell and Democratic Senator Edward Kennedy have called for cuts ranging from 100 billion to 210 billion dollars over the next five to seven years.

Bush also said he would require continued funding for the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), although he did not say how much he would ask for.

U.S. press reports have said SDI funding is set to receive a one billion dollar boost in fiscal 1993, to reach a total of five billion dollars.

The planned cuts in strategic missile stocks will see an additional 3,000 warheads removed from the 9,000 warhead strategic arsenal that Washington may keep under the terms of the strategic arms reduction treaty, U.S. press reports said.

'Deep Cuts' in Strategic Force

OW2901023492 Beijing XINHUA in English
0216 GMT 29 Jan 92

[Text] Washington, January 28 (XINHUA)—President George Bush today said that the United States will take deep cuts in its strategic forces if ex-Soviets respond with similar moves.

In his State of Union Address, Bush said that if the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS)—the

former Soviet Union—eliminates all land-based multiple warhead ballistic missiles, the United States will do the following:

- Eliminate all Peacekeeper missiles;
- Reduce the number of warheads on Minuteman missiles to one;
- Reduce the number of warheads on sea-based missiles by about one-third;
- Convert a substantial portion of strategic bombers to primarily conventional use.

Bush said that the United States will also unilaterally reduce or stop some weapons production programs and altogether, the military savings will be 50 billion dollars in the next five years.

U.S., Russian Disarmament Plans Viewed

Foreign Ministry Spokesman Comments

OW3001085092 Beijing XINHUA in English
0841 GMT 30 Jan 92

[Text] Beijing, January 30 (XINHUA)—A Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman said here today that China welcomes the disarmament plans respectively announced by U.S. President George Bush and Russian President Boris Yeltsin recently.

The spokesman, Duan Jin, made the remark at the weekly press conference this afternoon when he was asked to comment on the disarmament plans.

"We have taken notes of the disarmament plans respectively announced by President Bush and President Yeltsin," Duan said, adding that "we welcome this and hope the U.S. and the Russian federation will implement and complete these plans as soon as possible."

He reiterated that China has always opposed arms race, saying that China's position on a complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons is known to all.

To realize this goal, he added, China stands that the two nuclear powers which possess the largest and most advanced nuclear arsenals shoulder special responsibilities and obligations.

Says Disarmament Plans 'Welcome'

HK3001132592 Beijing ZHONGGUO XINWEN SHE
in Chinese 1215 GMT 30 Jan 92

[Text] Beijing, 30 Jan (ZHONGGUO XINWEN SHE)—Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman Duan Jin said today that China has taken note of the disarmament plans announced by President Bush and President Yeltsin respectively. He said the move was welcome and hoped that the United States and Russia will implement and fulfill the plans as soon as possible.

At the press briefing today, Duan Jin expressed his views on the nuclear disarmament remarks by Bush and Yeltsin.

As everyone knows, China has proposed the total prohibition and destruction of nuclear weapons and, to attain this target, the two nuclear powers possessing the largest and most sophisticated nuclear arsenals, shoulder special responsibility and obligation, Duan said. China is opposed to the arms race in outer space and has called for the prohibition of all space-based weapons, including antimissile missiles and antisatellite weapons, for a nuclear-free outer space. In this regard, the two countries which have the strongest military strike potential in space bear a special responsibility and obligation in preventing an outer space arms race and should thoroughly ban the development, experiments on, production, and deployment of space-based weapons and the destruction of all space weapons.

As to the measures adopted by the Chinese side in this regard, Duan Jin said that China's limited nuclear weapons comprise a very small number and are totally for self-defense.

Duan Jin said that the two countries, which have the largest nuclear arsenals are obliged to take the lead in the disarmament and stop the testing, production, and deploying of nuclear weapons. China will naturally take part in the process of nuclear disarmament and join efforts for the complete destruction of nuclear weapons, once the United States and Russia reduce their nuclear capacity to a level matching that of China.

Duan said that China is opposed to any arms race and has called for disarmament, complete prohibition and destruction of nuclear, chemical, biological, and space-based weapons, and large-scale reductions in conventional arms. China has already taken a series of disarmament moves on its own initiative.

Reports on Yeltsin Speech at UN Security Council

Calls for Arms Cuts

OW3101192792 Beijing XINHUA in English
1903 GMT 31 Jan 92

[Text] United Nations, January 31 (XINHUA)—Russian President Boris Yeltsin today called for making minimum defense sufficiency a fundamental law for the world.

"I am convinced that together we are capable of making the principle of minimum defense sufficiency a fundamental law of existence of contemporary states," Yeltsin told the security council summit this morning.

He expressed the belief that the time has come to considerably reduce the presence of means of destruction on the planet.

Yeltsin called for deep cuts in strategic offensive arms and tactical nuclear weapons, significant limitations on nuclear testing and even toward its complete cessation, elimination of anti-satellite systems, considerable reduction in conventional armaments and armed forces, practical implementation of international agreements on the

prohibition of chemical and bacteriological weapons and more reliable barriers to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

Speaking of the experts engaged in the developments and production of such weapons, including nuclear physicists, Yeltsin said his country "is fully aware of its own responsibility and is taking steps to provide social security to such experts."

The pledge is obviously aimed at relieving the concerns of some people who fear that the nuclear physicists of the former Soviet Union would be ready for hire by non-nuclear countries and thus leading to nuclear proliferation.

The Russian president asked for the creation of a global system for protection of the world community, saying such a system could be based on a reorientation of the U.S. strategic defense initiative to make use of high technologies developed in Russia's defense complex.

Referring to the role of the United Nations, Yeltsin, whose country inherited the Soviet seat at the United Nations including the Security Council, Yeltsin said the world body has a special role in establishing a new international climate in the world [sentence as received].

"This organization has stood the test of time and managed even in the ice-cold age of confrontation to preserve the nascent norms of civilized international cohabitation contained in its charter," he added.

The president welcomed the increased U.N. efforts to strengthen global and regional stability and build a new world order based on the equality of all states, big or small.

He pledged to "make use of the effective role" of the United Nations and the Security Council and take part in the search for lasting solutions to the Yugoslav and Afghan problems and for a normalization of the situation in the near and Middle East, Cambodia and other regions.

Other States Urged To Follow

OW0102072592 Beijing XINHUA in English
0706 GMT 1 Feb 92

[Text] United Nations, January 31 (XINHUA)—Russian President Boris Yeltsin today called on other countries to follow the example of Russia and the United States in arms reduction.

Speaking at a press conference here this afternoon after the Security Council summit, Yeltsin said the new approach he and U.S. President George Bush made to disarmament "is not a monopoly of Russia and the United States."

"We invite other major military powers to follow suit," he declared.

Bush and Yeltsin both made new arms control proposals this week, that would reduce the American strategic nuclear arsenal to between 4,500 and 5,000 warheads, about 60 percent of the current level, and the Russian long-range nuclear warheads to between 2,000 and 2,500.

The Russian president noted that in the presidential statement adopted by the UN Security Council summit today, the council laid stress on the implementation by all of the obligations in the field of arms reduction and non-proliferation.

"Russia will consistently implement the agreements reached both within the framework of cooperation with its partners within the commonwealth and at international forums," he added.

Yeltsin called for the establishment of a system of protection from space with the joint efforts of Russia and the United States and the joint exploitation of the system.

"Then there won't be any rivalry of the two major states—Russia and the United States, because today we no longer consider the United States as our potential opponent and we wish to be allies," he declared.

He predicted that with a global system of protection from outer space and its joint exploitation, there would be no need for nuclear weapons, submarines and other weapons.

This would also put to use the 3,000 nuclear specialists and experts in the former Soviet Union and prevent them from drifting abroad and spreading the nuclear technology to other countries and save more than 100 billion U.S. dollars right away by cutting "very deeply" into the country's strategic and nuclear weapons and liquidating or simplifying its submarines, according to Yeltsin.

Meanwhile, in a letter to the UN secretary-general on January 29, the Russian president outlined the measures his country would take to control arms.

In addition to the cut in strategic offensive arms, he also promised to eliminate one-third of the sea-launched tactical nuclear weapons, half of the nuclear warheads for ground-to-air missiles and half of its air-launched tactical nuclear munitions.

He also expressed his readiness to destroy existing anti-satellite systems and work out an agreement for a total ban on weapons specially designed to attack satellites in addition to cuts in conventional arms and destruction and prohibition of biological and chemical weapons.

Premier Addresses UN Security Council

CM0302121692 Beijing RENMIN RIBAO
OVERSEAS EDITION in Chinese 3 Feb 92 pp 1, 4

["Full Text" of speech by Premier Li Peng at UN Security Council summit in New York on 31 January]

[Excerpts] United Nations, Jan 31 (XINHUA)—Mr. President, Mr. Secretary-General, Your Excellencies: [passage omitted]

Mr. President, in order to win a genuine peace in the world and create a favourable development environment for the people in all countries, the international community is focusing more and more on the subject of what kind of new international order should be established, in our view,

such basic principles as sovereign equality of member states and non-interference in their internal affairs—as enshrined in the charter of the United Nations—should be observed by all its members without exception. In compliance with the spirit of the charter and the established norms governing international relations and in light of the changes in the international situation, the Chinese Government wishes to share with the governments of other countries some of its basic views concerning the establishment of a new international order that will be stable, rational, just and conducive to world peace and development. These basic views are: [passage omitted]

—Effective disarmament and arms control should be achieved in a fair, reasonable, comprehensive and balanced manner. Efforts should be stepped up to

attain complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear and chemical weapons at an early date and to ban the development of space weapons. Countries in possession of the largest nuclear and conventional arsenals should take the lead in discharging their special responsibilities for disarmament. All nuclear-weapon states should undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, or to use or threaten to use such weapons against non-nuclear-weapon states or nuclear-free zones. The nuclear weapons of the disintegrated Soviet Union should be placed under effective control. As the disarmament issues bears on national security of all states, it should be discussed and addressed with their participation. [passage omitted]

JAPAN

Foreign Minister Hails Bush Arms Cut Announcement

OW2901042592 Tokyo KYODO in English 0401 GMT 29 Jan 92

[Text] Tokyo, Jan. 29 KYODO—Foreign Minister Michio Watanabe on Wednesday hailed U.S. President George Bush's plan to reduce strategic nuclear weapons, saying it is a "brave" measure.

Watanabe said in a statement that Bush's policy on arms reduction made in his State of the Union message to Congress will contribute to peace and stability in the world and to establishing a new world order.

He said he strongly supports the decision as a "brave" measure for nuclear disarmament.

In Washington on Tuesday, the U.S. President hailed the death of communism and proposed a fresh round of reductions in strategic nuclear weapons and a 50-billion-dollar cut in defense spending over the next five years.

The nuclear weapon reduction plan features a proposal to turn land-based, multiple-warhead ballistic missiles into single-warhead missiles, slash the number of warheads deployed on Trident submarines by one-third and convert most of the U.S. strategic bombers to conventional use.

Bush is expected to discuss the proposal with Russian President Boris Yeltsin this weekend.

Watanabe said in the statement that he hopes leaders of Russia will swiftly and positively cope with Bush's proposal and that they will carry out unitary and strict management of nuclear weapons in the former Soviet Union and fulfill the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START).

Businesses Welcome Bush's Defense Outlay Cuts

OW2901111792 Tokyo KYODO in English 1106 GMT 29 Jan 92

[Text] Tokyo, Jan. 29 KYODO—Japanese business leaders Wednesday welcomed U.S. President George Bush's proposal to reduce strategic nuclear weapons and slash defense outlays.

Gaishi Hiraiwa, chairman of the powerful Federation of Economic Organizations (Keidanren), said the Bush proposal "reflects the extraordinary resolution of the United States to realize world peace."

The proposal was included in Bush's State of the Union message delivered Tuesday to Congress.

Hiraiwa urged the Japanese Government to implement measures for an early recovery of the domestic economy to help promote global economic expansion.

Rokuro Ishikawa, president of the Japan Chamber of Commerce and Industry, called Bush's decision "a wise

choice" for the reactivation of the U.S. economy and restoration of its competitive power.

Takeshi Nagano, chairman of the Japan Federation of Employers' Associations (Nikkeiren), expressed hope the President's tax cut offer will help trim the U.S. budget deficit and pave the way for economic reconstruction.

Prime Minister Addresses UN Security Council

OW3101223492 Tokyo KYODO in English 2220 GMT 31 Jan 92

["Text" of speech by Prime Minister Miyazawa to the UN Security Council in New York on 31 January]

[Excerpts] New York, Jan. 31 KYODO—Prime Minister Major,

Secretary General Butrus Ghali,

Your Majesty and Excellencies, [passage omitted]

What are the issues confronting the United Nations today as it responds to expectations of the role it is to play in the attainment and maintenance of peace? [passage omitted]

Arms Control and Disarmament

Mr. President,

In securing peace, the United Nations also has a tremendously important role to play in the field of arms control and disarmament. Japan has been actively contributing to strengthening the role of the U.N. in that field and has strongly supported the efforts of the countries concerned toward disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament, with a view to attaining strategic stability at a lower level of armament. I welcome the disarmament proposals made recently by President Bush and President Yeltsin. I sincerely hope that, through consultations between the United States and the Russian Federation, they will lead to concrete results.

The dramatic changes in the international milieu have once again highlighted the importance of disarmament efforts, including those to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. I need not point out to those assembled here today that, with the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the birth of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), the question of how to prevent the dissemination of these weapons, of their production facilities, and of related technologies is one of vital importance. I commend the leaders of the CIS for their determination to liberate their institutions from military domination, and I hope that they will continue to work to prevent the proliferation of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction as well as related technologies.

The proliferation and transfer of weapons is a matter of concern to every member of the international community. Spurred by initiatives from Japan and the EC countries, last year the General Assembly formally adopted a resolution to establish of the Security Council to work together for the smooth implementation of this register. [sentence as received] Steps to strengthen the

regime of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and to conclude successfully negotiations this year on the convention of chemical weapons are also of major importance. It is incumbent upon the Security Council to be seized with the developments made in these areas.

Conclusion

Mr. President,

In the light of the circumstances I have just described, I should like to propose the following measures to render the United Nations more suited to the international situation of the 21st century. [passage omitted]

Fourth, in the area of arms control, I propose that concrete measures be urgently considered for bolstering the efforts of the United Nations and the countries concerned to strengthen the control of and to prevent the proliferation of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction in the wake of the dissolution of the Soviet Union, and to restrain the international transfer of conventional weapons. [passage omitted]

Foreign Minister Views Bush-Yeltsin Talks

OW0202134292 Tokyo NHK General Television Network in Japanese 0000 GMT 2 Feb 92

[Panel discussion on "UN Security Council Summit Talks, Nuclear Disarmament, and How the World Will Move" with Michio Watanabe, deputy prime minister and foreign minister; Makoto Momoi, commentator; Takehiko Kamo, Tokyo University professor; and Yutaka Akino, Tsukuba University professor; moderated by NHK commentator Korehito Obama—live]

[Excerpts] [Obama] Good morning. The UN Security Council [UNSC] summit in New York has just concluded. At the summit, plans for strengthening the UN's role in maintaining world peace in the post-cold war era have been worked out. The United Nations, which failed to carry out its tasks well during the cold war, will now start making new moves.

Meanwhile, U.S. President Bush and Russian President Yeltsin held talks, and it has been decided that the two nations will cooperate on issues like drastic reductions of nuclear weapons, to establish friendly relations between them.

In view of such moves, therefore, we have invited Foreign Minister Michio Watanabe to this panel discussion on how the world will move from now on.

First, we would like to ask your views on the talks between President Bush and President Yeltsin; they concluded about five hours ago. [passage omitted]

Foreign Minister Watanabe, what is your assessment of the talks between the two top leaders?

[Watanabe] In general, the fact is that the issues discussed are not new; they have not come up just since Yeltsin's assumption of power. The two confronting superpowers—the United States and the Soviet Union—

have reached a deadlock in the race for military expansion. They are also at an economic impasse. Therefore, proposals on START were made during talks between Gorbachev and Bush—no, Reagan. That is, proposals on START and other issues were made and an accord was reached at Gorbachev-Reagan talks. Moreover, proposals were made for the complete abolition of intermediate nuclear missiles and for strategic nuclear arms. During this first stage, various measures were taken. Some accords have been carried out, others have not, and others will be carried out starting now. Thus, these current talks may be seen as a kind of continuation.

At this juncture, Yeltsin has undertaken more drastic reform in Russia, and the former Soviet Union has fractured. For the time being, the republics are unified under the umbrella of the Commonwealth of Independent States [CIS] in order to deal with issues like nuclear weapons. But the reality is that the Commonwealth is made up of several countries. Under these circumstances, President Yeltsin, who plays a leading role in control of nuclear weapons, has visited the United States and held talks with President Bush on various issues, including future disarmament and other global problems. I think this is a major and unprecedented advance in the second stage of the formation of a new world order [words indistinct].

[Obama] I see. Then, an accord must have been reached at the summit on cooperation between the two nations in abolishing nuclear weapons. Further negotiations will be held later on concrete measures. As the minister has just mentioned, the two nations had no choice but to move toward nuclear disarmament because of their economic stalemate. But are there other concerns or other factors forming the background for this move? Mr. Kamo, what do you think of it?

[Kamo] I think there are motives or reasons for the actions of the U.S. people, as well as Mr. Yeltsin, and others of the CIS. First, the process of nuclear arms reduction and disarmament is still in progress and has not yet been completed. [passage omitted]

[Obama] Then I would like to ask the foreign minister. Strategic nuclear weapons in the Soviet Union are located in four republics—Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan—and tactical nuclear weapons are said to be held in all 12 republics. The Russian Republic, or rather President Yeltsin, made promises for reduction of nuclear weapons. Does he really have the power to control the whole CIS on this issue?

[Watanabe] This is a question that will continue to be raised henceforth, I think. The abolition of nuclear arms is the ideal goal pursued by mankind. Russia is moving toward democracy and freedom, away from one-party autocracy. This can be called a revolution. The country's system has turned into one whereby voices of the people are heeded. Besides, there was the Chernobyl power plant explosion incident—which is something like having a nuclear bomb dropped on themselves before being able to drop one on another country. As such, the

Russian people are aware how dreadful the nuclear arms are. There is this background to note.

In addition, there are the financial problems as talked about here earlier. The Russian people know that there is not much merit in both sides doing the stupid thing of continuing to increase arms.

Then the Soviet Union collapsed, and the United States came to the side of wanting to help the country, proposing that both sides mutually reduce their arms. Of course, things will not happen overnight. As someone mentioned earlier, the armed forces would not want to give in. Even though things will not happen overnight, the country will move toward that direction for sure,

though gradually. There may be no problem as far as strategic nuclear arms are concerned. Even though Russia is now saying that the tactical nuclear arms now in all republics will be put under unified control, whether the tactical nuclear arms can be really controlled will depend on future negotiations.

Another relevant point is how the international community will exert pressure on this issue—by way of deciding to postpone extending assistance or resorting to other ways.

Hence, I will say I am not optimistic about the prospect though I have hopes about it. [passage omitted]

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

CSCE Foreign Ministers Meet in Prague

CSFR President Havel Speaks

LD3001124392 Prague Stanice Ceskoslovensko
Radio Network in Czech 0901 GMT 30 Jan 92

[Speech by CSFR President Vaclav Havel at the CSCE foreign ministers' meeting in the Prague Palace of Culture—live]

[Excerpts] Ladies and gentlemen, dear audience. First of all, allow me to welcome you on behalf of Czechoslovakia to this conference. It is the first time that our country has played host to a conference of this significance, and there is no need for me to emphasize that we regard it as a great honor. [passage omitted]

The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe is a political environment which could play a decisive role in this respect. First of all since it associates, or will associate in the nearest future, all European countries. Second, because it interlinks Europe not only with the North American continent, with which Europe is intrinsically bound by its civilization, but also with a large part of Asia which, too, is closely connected to it by important historical, political, and economic bonds and which, by its contemporary present, more authentic than hitherto, brings a radically new and all-round important element into the Helsinki process.

Mainly, however, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe is such an environment due to the fact that it has all the basic dimensions that truly peaceful cooperation must have. From care for human rights and democratic institutions, through to interest in economic cooperation, to the military and security dimension. I think that the CSCE could be the highest umbrella over all European integration processes, their basic framework, a context, a solid ground from which they grow. It could become a kind of natural, permanent, and self-evident background of all European activity. I believe that the CSCE has the preconditions to change into such a solid ground relatively soon. And it would be excellent if this year's summit, called Helsinki II, which it is our task to prepare, could be a decisive step forward in this direction.

Were the first Helsinki conference in 1975 the beginning of the first act of CSCE history, then Helsinki in 1992 could be the beginning of act two. That means an act whose aim would be what I have already spoken about. To change this community into a truly solid and functioning system offering effective and reliable guarantees of peaceful cooperation, good coexistence, and a continuously deeper political integration of Europe on a democratic basis.

If Europe changes one day into a confederal system, as many of us have envisaged, then it will most likely

happen against the very background of the thus constructed and developed Helsinki system, and stemming from this system.

What needs to be done for the Helsinki process to take this path? Many specific options exist and have been suggested. No doubt the conference will talk about them. Therefore I will mention only some of them here, and only very generally at that, and without regard to whether they are feasible immediately, in the course of time, or only from a long-term perspective. [passage omitted]

Fourth, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe has played an important role and can play an even more important role in the sphere of disarmament treaties and in the monitoring of their execution. The main reasons for the stockpiling of military arsenals, especially of strategic ones, have gone and the opportunity is thus opening up to speed up and facilitate disarmament. The CSCE should clearly be considering how to make various military and armament matters as transparent as possible. It should be considering the most effective ways through which it can regulate the production of arms and monitor the export of arms. It should be considering how to punish breachings of contractual pledges and how to offer massive assistance to the conversion of the armament industry, for this is in the interest of all member countries. Nowadays the states of the former Soviet Union are having major problems with the scrapping, cutting, or redeployment of nuclear potential. I think that it would be in the interest of all of us if the CSCE were to offer its specific assistance in this sphere too.

Esteemed gathering, each war is usually followed by a peace conference that reaches a new settlement in a manner binding for all the postwar conditions. In fact we are also living in a postwar era because the cold war has definitively ended. And today, we are too urgently experiencing a need for some kind of a peace conference that will bring light to the rather chaotic situation left for us by the cold war and that would be conducive to a new stabilization of European conditions.

Those who met in Helsinki for the first time in 1975 had no idea that the community that came into being then would now, 17 years later, be capable of accommodating this need and create, affirm, and guarantee the new European order. The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe has simply a chance to take up this historical opportunity and to answer the call of our era. In conclusion I would like to assure you that Czechoslovakia, which chairs the CSCE now, will do all in her power to ensure that the Helsinki process continues successfully, that it acquires a new dynamism, and that it gradually turns into the structure that will become the fundamental and most important creator of the new European order and constitute the main and at the same time watertight guarantee of peaceful development, the objective of which is a united Europe properly interconnected with the western and eastern part of our hemisphere, contributing to a better life on our planet.

Thank you for your attention. I wish success to your talks.

Ministers Hold News Conference

LD3101194192 Prague Federal 1 Television Network
in Czech 1209 GMT 31 Jan 92

[News conference by Czechoslovak Foreign Minister Jiri Dienstbier, German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher, and Swedish Foreign Minister Margaretha af Ugglas with foreign correspondents at the conclusion of the CSCE foreign ministers council session at the Palace of Culture in Prague on 31 January; Genscher and Ugglas remarks in German and English, respectively, with simultaneous Czech translation; correspondents' questions simultaneously translated from respective languages into Czech—live]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] [Dienstbier] The Prague session has confirmed the CSCE's ability to respond to developments in Europe with flexibility. However, future developments will show to what extent we will manage to execute the decisions made in Prague. All of us will strive for it. There might be yet another noteworthy aspect, which is that the break up of the Soviet Union and the conflict in Yugoslavia have changed considerably the original intentions concerning the preparation for the Prague session.

However, the results achieved in Prague show that the Helsinki process is capable of coping with such unexpected situations too, and this applies even to technical issues, to the issue of equipping the procedures hall with the necessary tables and chairs at the last moment. Furthermore, this meeting represents an important step on the path leading to the forming of interaction between existing international organizations and the Helsinki process. [passage omitted]

[Unidentified correspondent] My question is addressed to all esteemed ministers. How could you assess or describe, in the context of the European security process, the latest disarmament proposals and initiatives of President Bush and President Yeltsin? Thank you.

[Dienstbier] In my opinion these initiatives alone show how times have changed, because a year or two ago we still discussed how to reduce, in a balanced way, a small percentage of nuclear weapons, while our present problem is quite different. Our problem is how to dismantle these deployed weapons. As it is turning out this problem is just as difficult, if not more difficult than the armament itself, because it too will be enormously expensive. Nevertheless, all of us should be pleased to live in the era when the problems concerning nuclear weapons are altogether different than they were as little as two years ago.

[Ugglas] As Swedish foreign minister I welcomed this initiative and I think that what is very important is that the Americans are helping us to open this window of opportunity. This is a historical moment when the entire score of states of the former Soviet Union expressed

their will to be nuclear-free states. I think this represents a great opportunity. I am very pleased that both the United States and President Yeltsin are taking this opportunity.

[Genscher] I would like to say that we welcome this initiative of Presidents Bush and Yeltsin, because here we can see a new thinking and a new attitude to the issue of security and because it represents a real breakthrough in nuclear disarmament. I would like to take this opportunity to note that it is equally important to implement President Bush's initiative launched in 1991 and the initiative that President Gorbachev executed.

At issue are the cuts of short-range missiles and tactical weapons, because these are enormous arsenals with huge destructive power. Controlling these weapons is considerably more complex than controlling strategic arms, which are discussed precisely in connection with the statements by President Bush and President Yeltsin. The initiatives of these presidents should provide impulses to conclude a CFE I Treaty and the treaty on troop reduction, which is the treaty we would like to conclude by the end of July.

We will have to make headway in all spheres, we will have to adapt it to a new situation, because we must eliminate all dangers. This is why I proposed that the UN Security Council, which meets in New York today, should discuss not only the issue of elimination of nuclear weapons but also the issue of nuclear know-how. So the Security Council will deal with these issues at today's session. [passage omitted]

[Unidentified correspondent, in English] I have one question for Mr. Genscher and one for Mr. Dienstbier. Mr. Genscher, do you expect talks on eliminating nuclear weapons or do you think that these will be bilateral talks—i.e. the United States and Soviet Union [as heard] discussing this? Do you expect the British and French to reduce their nuclear arsenals? [passage omitted]

[Genscher] [passage omitted] We are going to take a unilateral but parallel course of action in order not to lose time through unnecessary talks. I think that such unilateral parallel talks are the correct and best way of holding talks about the necessary subject of talks—i.e. a system to verify the elimination of nuclear warheads. Nevertheless, we still have time to do that. It will not be possible to get rid of those 10,000 warheads overnight. This applies to the missiles of both the United States and the Soviet Union's successors.

[Dienstbier] [passage omitted] As I have already said at the beginning the problem is somewhere else nowadays. It concerns international cooperation in finding ways to eliminate nuclear arms on European territory, both strategic and above all tactical weapons which, being small, can—if we fail to keep an eye on them—in fact reach places all over the world. Thus my view is that agreements are more likely to be concluded on cooperation in these spheres than concerning the issues how and

by how many they are going to be reduced as used to be the agenda during all the talks in the past. [passage omitted]

FRG's Genscher on Proliferation

*LD3001130592 Berlin ADN in German 1200 GMT
30 Jan 92*

[Text] Prague (ADN)—Hans-Dietrich Genscher, FRG foreign minister, urged today the CSCE states to make cooperative security effective and to counteract the unrestrained transfer of arms. Speaking at the CSCE foreign ministers' session—which opened here today and in which he took stock of the results achieved since the foreign ministers' conference held in Berlin last summer—Genscher described in five points the new goals that have to be aimed for.

The control of military power has to remain an essential element of the CSCE process, Genscher said, and here he

expressly welcomed Moscow's and Washington's intended disarmament plans. Genscher also said that after the informal consultations in Vienna, work should begin on a concrete mandate for a new start to the arms control process. Genscher also spoke firmly against a further proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and against the unchecked transfer of conventional weapons and weapons technology. He said: "Faced with enormous weapons, development, and production capacities that can no longer be used for one's own needs, I turn to all those gathered here with the urgent appeal that they undertake all appropriate steps to stem arms transfers and to reduce their weapons arsenals."

Regarding the further institutionalization of the CSCE, he came out in favor of creating new possibilities for dealing with crises. At the same time, it is necessary to create a management body that can implement operational measures in cases of crises and conflicts.

RESPONSE TO BUSH INITIATIVE

Yeltsin Delivers Statement on Disarmament

LD2901104192 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya
Ostankino Television First Program Network
in Russian 0900 GMT 29 Jan 92

[Statement on disarmament by Russian Federation President Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin on 29 January; place not given—recorded. Moscow TASS in English at 1119 GMT on 29 January 1992 and Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian on 30 January 1992, First Edition, pages 1 and 2 also carry the text of Yeltsin's statement. Variations among the three versions are noted below.]

[Text] [TASS English carries the opening: "On Russia's Policy in the Field of Arms Limitation and Reduction." ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA publishes the speech under the headline: "On Russia's Policy in the Field of Arms Limitation and Reduction: The Statement by Russian Federation President B. N. Yeltsin on 29 January 1992."]

Respected citizens of Russia [TASS English omits "Respected"]: My address today is devoted to an issue of vital significance. It is a matter of practical measures by Russia in the sphere of the limitation and reduction of weapons.

Our fundamental position is the following: Nuclear weapons and other means of mass destruction in the world must be eliminated. Of course, this must be done gradually and on an equal basis. In this vitally important matter we are open to cooperation with all states and international organizations, including within the framework of the United Nations.

The measures I will speak about today have been prepared on the basis of constant interaction among member states of the Commonwealth of Independent States [CIS] and in accordance with the accords reached at the meetings of their leaders in Minsk, Alma-Ata, and Moscow.

Russia considers itself the legal successor to the USSR in terms of responsibility for carrying out international obligations. We confirm all of our obligations with regard to the bilateral and multilateral accords in the sphere of arms limitation and disarmament that were signed by the Soviet Union and are in operation at the current time.

The Russian leadership confirms its adherence to the course of radical reduction of nuclear weapons, guaranteeing the maximum security of nuclear weapons and guaranteeing the security all of the facilities connected with the development, production, and operation of such weapons.

Russia is proposing an initiative on the creation of an international agency to ensure the reduction of nuclear arms. During the subsequent stages this agency could gradually take under its control the whole nuclear cycle from the mining of uranium and the production of deuterium and tritium, to the storage of waste. [TASS English reads "to the dumping of nuclear waste."]

The measures we are taking in the disarmament sphere in no way undermine the defense capabilities of Russia or the CIS states. We are talking specifically about a reasonable, minimum sufficiency of nuclear and conventional arms.

This is our main principle in building the armed forces. Implementing it will make it possible to save considerable funds. These funds will be directed for civilian purposes for social issues [TASS English and ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA omit "for social issues"] and the implementation of reforms.

Conditions are prime today, making it possible to take a number of new, major steps in arms reduction. We are undertaking a proportion of these unilaterally, and others on a reciprocal basis.

We have done, and intend first and foremost to do the following: First, in the area of strategic offensive weapons: We will submit for ratification to the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation the treaty on strategic offensive weapons [START Treaty]. The process of ratifying this treaty has also begun in the United States. I believe that the implementation of this vital document, including its approval by Belarus, Kazakhstan, and the Ukraine, should be carried out as promptly as possible. Even before the START Treaty enters into force, Russia will take a whole range of major steps aimed at cutting the strategic arsenal. About 600 land and sea-based strategic ballistic missiles, or almost 1,250 nuclear warheads, have been removed from operational readiness [snyato s boevogo dezhurstva]. A total of 130 intercontinental ballistic missile launch silos have been destroyed or are being prepared for destruction. Six nuclear submarines have been prepared for the dismantling of their missile launchers. Programs for the development or modernization of several types of strategic offensive weapons have been halted. Strategic nuclear arms deployed on the territory of the Ukraine are to be dismantled [razukomplektovany] sooner than planned. The appropriate accords have been reached.

Let me stress that this is not a case of our unilateral disarmament. Parallel steps are being taken by the United States as a goodwill measure. Now, however, we can and need to advance significantly further along this path.

Recently the following decisions have been made:

The production of TU-160 and TU-95MS heavy bombers is being stopped [TASS English reads "will be stopped"].

The production of air-launched long-range cruise missiles [krylatyye rakety] of the existing types is being stopped [TASS English reads "will be stopped"]. We are prepared to renounce the creation of new types of such missiles on a reciprocal basis with the United States.

The production of the existing types of sea-based long-range nuclear cruise missiles is being stopped [TASS English omits the word "cruise" and concludes "will be

stopped"). New types of such missiles will not be created. At the same time we are prepared, on a reciprocal basis, to eliminate all existing sea-based long-range nuclear cruise missiles.

We are renouncing the holding of [TASS English reads "We will not hold"] exercises with the participation of large numbers of heavy bombers. This means that not more than 30 of them [TASS English reads "no more than 30 (such bombers)"] may be involved in one exercise.

The number of atomic submarines with ballistic missiles (SSBN's) which are on combat patrol has been halved and will be reduced further. We are prepared to renounce altogether the practice of combat patrol with the aid of such submarines, on a reciprocal basis.

Russia will reduce the number of strategic offensive weapons on operational readiness to the agreed number within a three-year period instead of seven years.

Thus, we will arrive four years earlier at the level that is envisaged by the relevant treaty. Given that there is mutual understanding with the United States, we could proceed in this direction even faster. We are in favor of the strategic offensive weapons retained by the United States and Russia after the reduction not being aimed at Russian and U.S. targets, respectively.

Important talks with leaders of Western countries are to take place in the forthcoming days. Proposals have been prepared on new, in-depth, several-fold cuts in strategic offensive weapons, to the level of 2,000 to 2,500 strategic nuclear weapons on each of the sides. [Podgotovleny predlozheniya o novom glubokom sokrashchenii strategicheskikh nastupatelnykh vooruzheniy v neskolko raz - do 2,000-2,500 strategicheskikh yadernykh boyezaryadov u kazhdoy storony.] In doing so we hope that other nuclear powers like China, Britain, and France will join the process of real nuclear disarmament.

Second, tactical nuclear weapons: Major measures concerning their reduction have already been undertaken simultaneously with the United States.

During the recent period, production has been stopped of nuclear warheads for land-based tactical missiles, and also production of nuclear artillery shells and nuclear mines. Stocks of such nuclear devices will be eliminated. Russia is eliminating one-third of sea-based tactical nuclear weapons and one-half of nuclear warheads for anti-aircraft missiles. Measures in this direction have already been taken. We also intend to halve stocks of air-launched [aviatsionnyye] tactical nuclear munitions [TASS English reads "tactical nuclear ammunition for the Air Force"]. The remaining tactical air-launched nuclear weapons [TASS English reads "weapons for the Air Force"] could, on a reciprocal basis with the United States, be removed from combat units of the frontline (tactical) air force units and placed in centralized storage bases.

Third, antimissile defense and space: Russia confirms its adherence to the ABM Treaty. It is an important factor in maintaining strategic stability in the world. We are

ready to continue discussion without prejudice of the American proposal on the limitation [ogranicheniye] non-nuclear ABM systems. [TASS English reads: "We are ready to continue impartial discussion of the U.S. proposal on the limitation of non-nuclear antiballistic missile systems." ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA reads: "We are ready to continue discussion without prejudice of the American proposal on limited [ogranichennyye] non-nuclear ABM systems."]

Our principle is known: If it strengthens strategic stability in the world and Russia's security, we will support this approach. I also announce that Russia is ready, on the basis of reciprocity with the United States, to eliminate the existing antisatellite systems and to work out an accord to ban completely the weapons which have been specially constructed to hit satellites. We are ready jointly to work out and subsequently to create and jointly operate a global system of defense in place of SDI.

Fourth, nuclear weapons tests and the manufacture of fissile [passheplyayushchiy] materials for arms purposes [TASS English reads: "fissionable materials for military purposes"]: Russia is resolutely in favor of a ban on all nuclear arms testing. We are faithful to the year-long moratorium on nuclear explosions announced in October 1991, and we hope that other nuclear powers will likewise refrain from carrying out nuclear testing. A climate of mutual restraint would facilitate the attainment of accords on not carrying out such tests altogether, possibly curtailing the number of tests gradually.

In the interests of resolving this task once and for all, we propose to the United States that bilateral talks on further limiting the testing of nuclear arms be resumed.

Russia intends to continue fulfillment of the program for ending the production of weapons grade plutonium. Industrial reactors for making weapons grade plutonium will be stopped before the year 2000, and several of them will be stopped in 1993 under an accelerated timetable.

We confirm the offer to the United States that agreement be reached on a verified [kontroliruyemyy] [TASS English reads "controlled"] cessation of the production of fissile [rassheplyayushchiy] [TASS English reads "fissionable"] materials for weapons.

Fifth, the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the means of their delivery: Russia confirms its obligations under the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, including those as a depository. We are counting upon the treaty being joined in as quickly as possible as non-nuclear states by Belarus, Kazakhstan, and the Ukraine, and also other CIS member states. Russia states its full support for the activity of the International Atomic Energy Agency [IAEA] and is in favor of the effectiveness of its guarantees being intensified.

We are taking additional steps to prevent our exports leading to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Work is now being conducted aimed at bringing Russia in line with the principle of an all-embracing IAEA guarantee as a condition of our peaceful nuclear

exports. Russia, in principle, intends to join the international regime of non-proliferation of missiles and missile technology as an equal participant.

We support the efforts of the so-called Australia Group for control over chemical exports. The Russian Federation plans to adopt domestic legislation regulating the export from Russia of dual use materials, equipment, and technology that could be used to create nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons or combat missiles. A government system to control such exports is being established. We are going to establish very close cooperation and coordination between all participating CIS states on these matters. Russia supports the guiding principles on the arms trade approved in London in October 1991.

Sixth, conventional weapons: A motion to ratify the treaty on conventional armed forces in Europe has been introduced in the Russian parliament. The other CIS member states whose territory is covered by this treaty likewise attach importance to its ratification. Russia reaffirms its intention—along with the other members of the Commonwealth—to cut the actual numbers of the former USSR Armed Forces by 700,000.

Russia attaches great significance to the talks currently under way in Vienna on personnel reductions and confidence-building measures, and also to the new talks on security and cooperation in Europe. The latter could become a standing all-European forum for seeking ways of creating a collective, all-European security system.

In cooperation with Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan, Russia will press to reach an accord with China at talks regarding cuts in armed forces and armaments in the border region. A decision has been made not to hold major exercises in 1992 involving more than 13,000 men—and not just on the European part, but also on the Asiatic part of CIS territory.

We also hope that there is a possibility in the near future to sign a treaty on an Open Skies regime.

Seventh, chemical weapons: We are for the speediest possible conclusion, in 1992, of a global convention banning chemical weapons. This is essential in order to securely close the paths leading to the possession of chemical weapons, without detriment to the legitimate economic interests of the signatories to the convention. Russia adheres to the agreement with the United States on the non-production and elimination of chemical weapons, signed in 1990.

However, the timescale envisaged therein for the destruction of such weapons requires certain amendments. All of the chemical weapons of the former USSR are on the territory of Russia, who takes responsibility for their destruction. We are preparing an appropriate state program. We are open for cooperation in this matter with the United States and other interested countries.

Eighth, biological weapons: Russia favors the rigorous implementation of the 1972 convention banning biological weapons, and the creation of an appropriate mechanism on a multilateral basis for monitoring the implementation of measures for building confidence and openness. Considering that there is a lag in implementing the convention, I can now state that Russia is renouncing that section of provisos [TASS English reads "Russia abandons its reservations"] concerning the possibility of the retaliatory use of biological weapons. These provisos were made by the USSR under the Geneva Protocol of 1925 banning the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons in war.

Ninth, the defense budget: Russia will continue to make substantial reductions in its defense budget, imparting a social orientation to this area. In 1990 and 1991, defense expenditure was already reduced by 20 percent in terms of comparable prices, including a 30 percent reduction for purchases of weapons and equipment. In 1992, we intend to reduce military expenditure by another 10 percent (in 1991 prices). The volume of weapons purchases this year will be reduced by approximately half compared with last year.

Tenth, conversion: Russia welcomes international cooperation in the area of conversion of military production. Russia favors faster work in this regard. On our part, we will encourage this cooperation by creating a "most favored treatment system" [rezhim naibolshego blagopriyatstvovaniya] [TASS English reads "give priority to"] and by establishing tax benefits for relevant joint projects.

Respected citizens of Russia, I have just set out a plan of action for the Russian Federation concerning the issues of arms reductions and disarmament. I hope it will meet with your support and with understanding on the part of all CIS peoples. I am convinced that it is fully in keeping with the interests of our country and other states of the world. If it is possible to implement it, our life will not only become more calm and secure, but also more prosperous.

Several hours ago, U.S. President Bush addressed the U.S. people and proposed cuts of nuclear potential [ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA and TASS English read: "Several hours ago U.S. President G. Bush addressed the American people with a proposal for radical cuts in nuclear potentials and for measures to strengthen stability in the relations between our countries"]. We are constantly engaged in mutual consultations on these issues in preliminary terms. We are engaged in a dialogue on the practical implementation of this line and the initiatives that have been proposed. The closeness of the positions of both sides is noteworthy. Therein lies a guarantee of success on the path of reducing offensive nuclear arms.

Thank you for your attention.

BBC Airs Interview With Yeltsin

*LD3001143392 London BBC Television Network
in English 2230 GMT 29 Jan 92*

[Interview with Russian President Boris Yeltsin by correspondent David Dimbleby in Russia on 29 January; Yeltsin in Russian with superimposed English translations; from the "Newsnight" program—recorded]

[Text] [Dimbleby] Mr. President, you, today, have announced a speeding up of the abolition of nuclear weaponry in Russia. Are you acting faster all the time in response to pressure from the West in return for economic help?

[Yeltsin] No. It isn't connected directly with aid from the West; especially, as nobody from the West has placed any such conditions on Russia. It is our own policy, our own position, that we should change our vocabulary and stop talking about potential enemies—Britain, NATO, and the U.S.—and instead, start talking about mutual cooperation, or perhaps, an alliance between us. Therefore, there must be real trust between us, there must be a frank and open relationship. We have a new Russia, a democratic Russia, which must build democratic and honest relations with all its partners.

[Dimbleby] If it's not under pressure, is it an equal reduction or is Russia reducing faster than the United States?

[Yeltsin] Now that's for the specialists and the experts. You have to take into account that it was only today at 4 A.M., Moscow time, that President Bush announced his initiative, and I only made my announcement at nine o'clock. A difference of five hours. It's now up to the experts to make the detailed comparisons; well, there is a certain difference in the interpretation of our proposals, but, still, the positions are close. Perhaps, the only point on which there might be disagreement is that of naval bases.

[Dimbleby] Will you find that if you want to go ahead with the speeding up of from seven to three years of the start of reductions that that would actually need, require, American money and knowledge to achieve?

[Yeltsin] Yes, since there are a number of issues connected with the destruction of nuclear weapons, especially with the use of plutonium 239 and uranium 235. They shouldn't simply be stored, but utilized somehow. Our specialists have invented the technology for this so that it can be used as fuel for fast neutron power stations, and not for nuclear weapons. That's especially important. Of course, we have to work together to develop the technology, as I told Secretary of State Baker today.

[Dimbleby] Just so I understand it clearly, are you saying you'll consider George Bush's proposals that Russia eliminate all nuclear missiles on land? Are you going to consider that as a serious proposal—the multi-warhead missiles?

[Yeltsin] Well, unquestionably, these proposals must be taken seriously, especially by such an important partner.

We can't call the United States a potential enemy anymore. They are no longer a potential enemy. They are a partner in cooperation. However, these proposals are serious in themselves and they must be looked at with regard to all three armed forces; that is land, air, and sea forces. Overall, we will have to get our priorities right, but we will be prepared to make exceptions for some types of weapons.

[Dimbleby] You said that you're no longer targeting American cities. Is the same true of British cities? Are you no longer targeting British cities?

[Yeltsin] Well, I'm flying to London tomorrow, and we shall discuss that question with Mr. Major.

[Dimbleby] You want to tell him, not us?

[Yeltsin] I think that this must be a mutual process, and, therefore, we shall have to discuss it.

[Dimbleby] But, when you say a mutual process, as you know, Britain is replacing Polaris with Trident submarines, possibly with more warheads. Would this stand in the way of anything you might say about targeting Britain?

[Yeltsin] I must, just, say that we have been talking about this with the United States, with Mr. Baker, today. We're looking to France, to Britain, and China, to review the Russian and American initiatives, and then, perhaps, we will amend them. We don't want Britain to go back to the path it has followed for many, many decades. We don't want to consider Britain as a potential enemy again. We want Britain, ultimately, to become an ally. That's our main aim. We shall sign a declaration, then an agreement, and then form an alliance. We want to enter Europe, we want to be a full-blooded member of the European Community, of the world community. That's why we think it's a good idea to build up special global defense forces together and to work together on space programs to replace Star Wars; forces that can be used jointly—then if anything happens, either accidentally or deliberately, a nuclear strike for example, we could deal with it immediately. And that's despite the fact Russia is a potential opponent of the United States, Britain, and other European countries.

[Dimbleby] But, you took the first step with America, you said we're not, any longer, going to target American cities. You're not prepared to say the same about Britain, to me, now?

[Yeltsin] You see, that is still a difficult question technically. Yes, we can change the targets of missiles, and we can do that as soon as those, which are subject to the declarations which Mr. Bush and I made this morning, have been dismantled. We want to change the targets of those remaining missiles so that they are no longer aimed at America. I think that we will be able to come to a similar agreement with Mr. Major.

[Dimbleby] If America and Britain and Europe, then, are no longer targets, why does Russia need nuclear weapons at all?

[Yeltsin] Well, there are countries like Iraq. What if Iraq acquired a nuclear bomb or a nuclear missile? It might launch it at the Soviet Union, which is closer. For that reason, for reasons of restraint, we need a definite number of missiles. We're not talking about 5, 6, 10, 12, or 14,000 strategic warheads, but about 2,500 at the most. In other words, a several fold reduction.

[Dimbleby] There's great concern in the West about the control of nuclear weapons, and everybody has heard what you've said about joint control, the Commonwealth control of these weapons, but can they really be certain that the other republics, that form the Commonwealth, will also agree?—That the Ukraine, that Kazakhstan, that Belarus, will go along with these accords? And until they do, isn't there a serious risk of the weapons being in the wrong hands?

[Yeltsin] Yes. From a technical point of view, it is impossible to control them. A document has been signed in Alma-Ata by all four nuclear powers; that is Russia, the Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan, stating that control is in the hands of the president of Russia and secondarily, those of Marshal Shaposhnikov, the supreme commander of Commonwealth Forces. But, there must be a link-up between the four heads of state. We must take a political decision immediately on whether to use nuclear weapons or not—God forbid that we should use them, and everybody must be in agreement.

[Dimbleby] I know that, Mr. President, but I'm thinking not of the structures that you've set up, but of the danger the people see of political disruption and chaos. Your sudden visit to the Black Sea, for instance, the feelings that the Ukraine has toward Russia, that these things may create an instability and may end up with some of these weapons being in the wrong hands.

[Yeltsin] On the contrary, our visit to the Black Sea Fleet was linked to discussions of how to disarm the 30 percent of the Black Sea Fleet that carries nuclear weapons. They have to be stored in Russia, and destroyed in Russia. These are very complicated, technical questions. One thing I can say is that there is no danger, at present, of the uncontrolled use of nuclear weapons. It is impossible for any one country to control these weapons. It is technically impossible without the go ahead from the other countries.

[Dimbleby] One other thing that worries people about nuclear weapons is them getting into the wrong hands. Not these republics, but into the hands of, perhaps, people within the Russian Federation, of information being sold, of material being sold. That's just as powerful a concern as the control of actual nuclear missiles. Is there anything you can do, or you would like the West to do, to try and make sure that that doesn't happen?

[Yeltsin] Yes. Firstly, three countries, apart from Russia, well, that is the Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan, must also sign the agreement on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons to non-nuclear states. That's very important. Secondly, the brain drain. Recently, I had a

five-hour meeting with nuclear scientists and technicians at which all these questions were discussed in detail. There are about 3,000 of these specialists, they're very talented people, and strenuous efforts must be made to look after them. I intend to raise their current salaries of 800 to 1,000 rubles to 5,000 rubles to keep them here.

[Dimbleby] You think you can keep them here in Russia? You think you can find a way of doing that?

[Yeltsin] Yes, of course. For example, if we reach an agreement with the United States and, perhaps, Britain, to create a joint global system of nuclear defense in space, in place of Star Wars, we'll be able to find jobs for all of them.

[Dimbleby] Reassurances you're going to give and are giving about nuclear weapons are, of course, a precondition for economic assistance from the West. I want to ask you this: How vital is it for Russia, at this moment, that it does have aid help—money from the West?

[Yeltsin] I want to repeat, once again, that this is not connected with financial assistance from the West. It is, in any case, our policy to speed up the reduction of our nuclear weapons.

[Dimbleby] It's what Chancellor Kohl has said, that aid won't come, and they're the biggest benefactors at the moment, unless there is security and observance of nuclear treaties. Not me that's saying it.

[Yeltsin] I know what you're saying. But let's look at the situation a little differently: What if our reforms fail and conservative forces come to power in Russia? The secret police would go back to the old ways, they would restart an arms race with Britain, the United States, and the other nuclear powers, and that would cost the taxpayer hundreds, thousands of millions of dollars—hundreds of time more than it would cost now to insure that our reforms are not stifled. That is the standpoint from which we should look at the problem.

[Dimbleby] But is the aid vital to you in the sense that your finance minister, Mr. Gaydar, said that there would be mass starvation. I quote from TRUD: There would be mass starvation in March if Western credit dried up.

[Yeltsin] Well, of course. In any case, the decisive voice here must be ours, and when we approach these problems, we will be looking to our own resources first. And we know that the bulk of the burden falls on our shoulders. Nevertheless, Western aid will, to some extent, ameliorate the negative consequences, especially of price liberalization, and extend the government's credit in the eyes of the people. It will enable us to avoid explosions in the next few months.

[Dimbleby] Do you believe that the West is demonstrating sufficient imagination, at the moment in providing aid, and enough generosity, and is doing it at sufficient speed?

[Yeltsin] They haven't been imaginative enough with regard to the amount and in the way it's being handled, but the United States is setting a good example. From 10

February, a massive airlift will begin using 54 large transport aircraft to bring food aid here over a period of 14 days. I think that's a good example for Britain and others to follow.

[Dimbleby] Do the Russian people resent the West being called on to provide this help for their country? Do they resent it when George Bush says, as he said yesterday, we won the Cold War, and that, in a sense, Russia is now dependent?

[Yeltsin] Firstly, it was not the United States alone, but all of us together who won the Cold War. Secondly, what is the attitude of our people to aid; especially humanitarian aid? We have explained to our people that, yes, Russia is a great power and that it is awkward for us to accept such aid, especially humanitarian. But, we have told them that when such aid comes from the grass roots, from the people themselves, and that the British, French, and Americans sincerely want to help us, as well as the Japanese, the Canadians, and so on, then, in fact, it would be awkward to refuse that aid when it is given with a pure heart, when they want to help us during this difficult period of transition to a market economy. We've talked about this for seven years, and at last we have made a start, but, of course, our difficulties are enormous.

[Dimbleby] You yourself, Mr. President, have been very critical, in the Russian Parliament, about the way the reforms are going. You say they're going too slowly, you say privatization isn't working. What is it that's gone wrong here with the reforms that you've introduced? Why isn't it beginning to come through?

[Yeltsin] You see, for 70 years or more, people have grown up, lived, worked under a political dogma, a communist dogma, a totalitarian one. And psychologically, it isn't easy for them to make the transition to private property, to privatization.

[Dimbleby] But how do you persuade them to change? Because, you talk about people obstructing you, you talk about the mafia, you talk about old [word indistinct] of the Communist Party. Can you move all these people? Can you change their way of thinking?

[Yeltsin] I signed two orders today to speed up the privatization process, and they spell out the responsibility of those involved. I also signed an order today on freedom of trade: Every citizen and every organization can trade freely now, when and as they like, without asking permission. That will give a great boost to privatization. We're counting on that.

[Dimbleby] A decree is a decree. In the end, these things depend on the Russian people; changing their attitude. It depends on you removing people who, as you say, are trying to obstruct you, trying to prevent you doing this. Is that possible to do?

[Yeltsin] We do remove those who are obstructive, and there are many examples in the provinces and the republics where things aren't going badly, where they're going well, in fact. I have just visited Lower (?Assisk) in

the Krasnodar region, where land reform is doing very well. There are already 5,500 private farms there. They're tackling other questions, as well, and they're addressing their problems with great vigor. They have already destroyed, that is dissolved, state control of trade, shops have been given their own licenses, and privatization is going ahead. And so, it's clear to us from all this that the foundations have been laid.

[Dimbleby] But it's you that I am quoting. It's you who said that privatization has gone wrong, only 10 days ago in parliament.

[Yeltsin] Undoubtedly, not everything has gone the way we wanted or as fast as we would have liked; I spoke about that today. Nevertheless, we're taking measures and we're optimistic that in the end we shall solve our problems, although we are a little late by about five years.

[Dimbleby] You have opposition, here, from the central bank, from parliament; if you find yourself impeded by those forces, would you be prepared to take more direct control of affairs here? Some people talk about wise authoritarianism of the president actually ruling, entirely, without the constraints of parliament.

[Yeltsin] No. I am a democrat, and we shall find answers to all our problems through consultation. Consultation with parliament, with the Supreme Soviet, and with other institutions.

[Dimbleby] If you find, because you do face this opposition, that they are actually standing in your way, what can you do? How do you appeal? One has this impression of you with all these forces against you both of the old Communist Party, and in parliament, and out in the countryside, that there are a whole lot of forces ranged against you, and I don't understand how you, as one man, can overcome this.

[Yeltsin] Only through discussion, through constant political consultations, which I'm now holding with all the parties and all the groupings. It's you who are talking totalitarian leadership.

[Dimbleby] You wouldn't want to use authoritarian methods?

[Yeltsin] No.

[Dimbleby] You said that within six to eight months things would improve. If they don't improve then and you're not prepared to take further powers, would you stand down?

[Yeltsin] My powers are sufficient and I try not to talk about such pessimistic forecasts. I believe that things will work out and that by the end of year we shall be coping with the new prices and the economy will gradually begin to stabilize.

[Dimbleby] One last question. People in the West worry sometimes about what they see as your impetuous nature and your occasional ill health. Are you fit, now, to

sustain the growing pressures that you're going to be under over this next period?

[Yeltsin] When you work for 18 or 20 hours a day and play tennis, as I do, what do you expect? Where on earth do you get such provocative, speculative questions from?

[Dimbleby] And the impetuosity of your character, which is also cited?

[Yeltsin] Perhaps there's some truth in that, but I'll mellow with age.

Bush, Yeltsin Arms Initiatives Called 'Real Breakthrough'

LD2901205392 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service
in English 1810 GMT 29 Jan 92

[Text] Several hours after President Bush ended his State of the Union message to Congress, in which he announced the reduction of the nuclear arsenal of the United States the Russian President, Boris Yeltsin, appeared on television in Moscow to outline Russia's measures in that field. Vladislav Kozyakov comments:

The latest decisions to reduce strategic arms made by Moscow and Washington are very reminiscent of the moves they exchanged last autumn, when the United States said it would scrap most of its tactical nuclear arms and Moscow responded with cuts in short-range nuclear armaments that went even farther than the United States' initiatives. What was still more remarkable was that both sides decided to slash their nuclear arsenals not as a result of prolonged negotiations but through unilateral steps. This time the scenario has been the same, except for the fact that the issue on the agenda is strategic arms, posing a threat to the very existence of humanity. Needless to say, strategic nuclear arms have always been as costly as destabilizing.

President Yeltsin and President Bush are going to make a real breakthrough in the sphere of nuclear disarmament. The agreements they have already signed go much farther than the already signed INF Treaty. Russia and the United States are stopping the production and withdrawing from operational service and scrapping a whole number of strategic offensive arms. This applies to nuclear warheads, ballistic missiles, heavy bombers and submarines—in other words, the arsenals with which Moscow and Washington threatened each other for decades are diminishing.

The United States and Russia have become able to take these reciprocal steps due to fundamental changes in the world. President Bush has said that in the past 12 months the world has known changes of almost biblical proportions. One can even say that the latest world events have paved the way for further steps to build a new world order. In his television address the Russian President Boris Yeltsin said that nuclear weapons and other means of mass destruction must be eliminated. As long as they remain, we believe they would no longer be aimed at corresponding targets in Russia and America.

At the same time the Russian president came out with a number of other initiatives apart from nuclear arms reductions—a stop to nuclear testing, further cuts in tactical weapons, bans on chemical and biological weapons, restrictions on the production of fissionable materials and other fields of disarmament. Moscow and Washington had discussed some of those problems before, however without reaching agreement. However, one must remember that what seemed impossible yesterday can become a reality today. Russia and America have a unique chance to make another joint contribution to making the world a safer place for all.

Baker, Kozyrev Comment on Bush, Yeltsin Speeches

OW3001001192 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1715 GMT 29 Jan 92

[From "Diplomatic Panorama"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] "I am satisfied with the proposals U.S. President George Bush made in his yesterday's State of the Union address. They are aimed at drastic reductions in nuclear armaments," Russian President Boris Yeltsin said at the beginning of his meeting with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker today (January 29). Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev also took part in the meeting.

After the meeting Mr. Kozyrev and Mr. Baker held a news conference. President Yeltsin had by then left because, according to Mr. Kozyrev, he had to get ready for his forthcoming visit to Great Britain, the USA and Canada. (One of the journalists said Mr. Yeltsin was "looking pale" during the meeting.)

Mr. Baker said he had discussed with Mr. Yeltsin a wide range of matters, some of which concerned the Russian President's forthcoming meeting with President George Bush in Camp David on February 1. They also spoke about the economic programme of the Russian government and nuclear security.

The Antinuclear Proposals of George Bush and Boris Yeltsin

Mr. Baker said the proposals set forth by both presidents in addresses to their nations had been extensively discussed by both sides. But they implied both bilateral and unilateral measures, which was why both sides should carefully study them and discuss them at various levels.

The Secretary of State described the proposals as "far-reaching." He said they reflected new developments in both countries.

The ABM Treaty and SDI

The USA, Mr. Baker said, was fulfilling its commitments under the ABM Treaty. He mentioned this to the leaders of CIS member states during his meetings with them, trying to persuade them to stick to every previously signed agreement, including the ABM Treaty, the treaty on the peaceful use of nuclear energy and the treaty on the reduction of nuclear tests.

Mr. Baker thought there still existed a threat of nuclear attack from some states, which was why a space defence programme was essential for the USA.

Judging by what Mr. Kozyrev said in this connection, Mr. Yeltsin and Mr. Baker also discussed the possibility of Russia's being incorporated in the U.S. space antinuclear defence programme and other joint research and development programmes and projects.

Who Will The U.S. Missiles Be Aimed At?

In connection with Mr. Yeltsin's recent statement to the effect that Russian strategic missiles would no longer be aimed at targets on U.S. territory, Mr. Kozyrev said this was a political decision of the leadership of democratic Russia. "We do not regard the United States as an enemy, and therefore our missiles are not intended for strikes at civilian or military targets on U.S. territory," he said.

According to Mr. Kozyrev, this is the first time in history that such proposals have not been a propaganda exercise but have been intended for real cooperation.

He said the sides had decided to discuss technical ways of carrying out the proposals. There would be more concrete discussions in Camp David, whereupon the matter would be transferred to experts from both countries.

Whether U.S. missiles would still be aimed at targets on Russian territory or not would, Mr. Baker said, be discussed by Presidents Bush and Yeltsin in Camp David. A political decision should be taken to this effect before any technical work was started.

Comments on Yeltsin 29 Jan Speech

Support From Non-Russian Republics Weighed

*LD3001062792 Moscow TASS in English
0611 GMT 30 Jan 92*

[By TASS-ITAR correspondent Yuriy Sidorov]

[Text] London January 30 ITAR-TASS—President Boris Yeltsin of Russia sincerely strives for nuclear disarmament, Aleksandr Yakovlev, former adviser to the Soviet president, told the ITN television network on Wednesday [29 January]. Yakovlev is now in London at the invitation of the Royal Institute for International Relations.

In response to a question as to whether the Russian president may count on the support by other republics in the Commonwealth of Independent States for the implementation of a plan put forward by him for radical cuts in nuclear arsenals, Yakovlev said Yeltsin, Nazarbayev, Kravchuk and Shushkevich agreed on the issue in principle.

There will be probably no complications in this respect as regards Belarus and Kazakhstan. As far as Ukraine is concerned this is another matter. "But I believe that under the pressure of his own people and Western states, Kravchuk will support nuclear disarmament."

Asked whether a threat to peace would emerge in view of the current deplorable condition of the nuclear arms of the former Soviet Union and the morale of those who are responsible for guarding them, Yakovlev said: "Even though I am not a specialist, I still believe that a disaster may occur at any point of the globe. Therefore the sooner these weapons are eliminated, the better it will be for Russia, the United States, for your country and for all other states."

Having described the position of the servicemen of the former Soviet Union as difficult and uncertain, Yakovlev emphasised that their problems could hardly be associated with nuclear danger.

Japanese Prime Minister Cited

*LD3001092192 Moscow TASS in English
0803 GMT 30 Jan 92*

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Vladimir Solntsev]

[Text] Tokyo January 30 TASS—Prime Minister Kiichi Miyazawa of Japan today made a positive assessment, although a rather reserved one, of Boris Yeltsin's statement "On Russia's Policy on Limitation and Reduction of Weapons."

"I think this is a good thing in principle and it can be assessed positively," he said in response to journalists' questions in parliament.

At the same time the head of the Japanese Government pointed out that "there are various problems which should be closely examined by specialists."

The Japanese Government positively assesses the fact that the president of Russia has shown a broad and active approach to disarmament issues, sources in the Japanese Foreign Ministry told TASS today.

According to the sources, Tokyo hopes that nuclear weapons on the territories of Russia and other members of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) will be under a strict centralised control and that CIS members themselves will actively meet commitments in the field of arms control and disarmament.

The Japanese Government expresses hope that the initiatives proposed by U.S. President George Bush and Russia's President Boris Yeltsin will promote further effort in the field of nuclear disarmament, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and the strengthening of global peace and security, the ministry sources said.

State of the Union Summarized, Called 'Very Significant'

*PM2901212192 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
30 Jan 92 Morning Edition p 1*

[Report by Artur Blinov and Aleksandr Sychev: "G. Bush Addresses the Nation"]

[Excerpts] U.S. President George Bush delivered the "State of the Union" message at a joint session of the two houses of Congress.

This address to the nation was of special significance. November will see a presidential election in which Americans will decide either to replace the White House incumbent or to give Bush a second term running the country. The aim of the "most important speech in the President's political life" was to recover the confidence of the voters, most of whom, according to the results of a recent public opinion poll, prefer Bush's rivals. [passage omitted]

But, there is no doubt that President Bush's foreign policy initiatives are very significant.

Bush said that "if the Commonwealth of Independent States, the former Soviet Union, eliminates all of its ground-launched ballistic missiles with multiple warheads," the United States will destroy all of its Peace-keeper ICBM's, also known as MX, and will reduce the number of warheads on Minuteman missiles to one on each and the number of warheads on sea-launched missiles by approximately one-third.

The construction of the new B-2 strategic bomber, using Stealth antiradar technology, will be confined to the 20 aircraft that already have been ordered, instead of the planned 75. Further production of this bomber will be halted. The United States will cease production of the new W-88 warheads for Trident submarines and will freeze purchases by the Pentagon of the modified cruise missile at the present level (640). Moreover, a considerable proportion of the strategic bombers will be reequipped so that they can be used mainly with nonnuclear weapons.

The military program cuts planned by the U.S. Administration are to provide an additional savings of around \$50 billion over the next five years. However, this proposal falls well short of the demands made by the Democrats and even by a number of Republicans in Congress.

Bush informed Moscow of his proposals and received, as he put it, a "very positive response." This matter will be discussed in greater detail at the talks the U.S. and Russian Presidents are to hold at the end of the week when they meet at the President's out-of-town residence at Camp David. [passage omitted]

Further Commentaries on Yeltsin 29 Jan Initiative

'Real Nuclear Arms Cuts'

LD3001164892 Moscow TASS in English
1558 GMT 30 Jan 92

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondent Andrey Surzhanskiy]

[Text] Moscow January 30 TASS—The latest disarmament initiatives advanced by Russian President Boris Yeltsin add new provisions to the START Treaty and will result in a drastic and real nuclear arms cuts in Russia and the United States, Aleksey Obukhov, a Russian Foreign Ministry spokesman, told reporters on Thursday [30 January].

The move to stop the production of modern Tu-160 and Tu-95MS heavy bombers is a limitation which was not envisaged by the START Treaty, he said.

Russia's refusal to engage a big number of heavy bombers in military manoeuvres is also a novelty, according to General Viktor Koltunov, a spokesman for the General Headquarters of the Armed Forces of the Commonwealth. Earlier up to 60 bombers were allowed to take part in each manoeuvres, now their number is being cut down to 30, he explained. In fact, Russia is drastically decreasing the scope of such military manoeuvres, he added.

The Russian president also suggested to cut down two times the number of submarines carrying ballistic missiles on combat duty.

"Russia is ready to renounce the practice of combat patrolling of such submarines" on a mutual basis, Obukhov said, adding the country intends to fulfil its start commitments earlier and will cut its strategic offensive arms in 3 years instead of the envisaged 7 years.

Russia plans, on an equal basis with the United States, to eliminate up to 2-2.5 thousand nuclear warheads, and the question will be discussed at the forthcoming meeting between the Russian and U.S. Presidents in Camp David, Obukhov disclosed.

Both Obukhov and Koltunov denied mass media allegations that the United States is eliminating outdated weapons while Russia is liquidating the modern ones. Obukhov expressed the hope the sides would not strive to get unilateral advantages.

Speed of Yeltsin Actions Questioned

PM3001153392 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jan 92 p 1

[Commentary by M. Chikin: "What Gorbachev Began, Yeltsin Has Deepened. Yesterday the Russian President Made a Statement on Nuclear Policy"]

[Text] The problem is simple. Upper Volta with missiles, minus the missiles. What will be left? Correct.

Now it has become clear once and for all what the president had been doing in the two days of his absence. The result of the "difficult Monday" is the statement on the reduction of nuclear missiles. The basic idea is to eliminate them all. But in stages. And to set up for the purpose of verification an international agency to control the whole production process—from the laboratory to the nuclear graveyard. (Why then the laboratory at all?) The doctrine of reasonable minimum sufficiency of nuclear and conventional weapons is being put into effect. Although the statement actually talks about the adoption of decisions on conditions of reciprocity, a large part of the statement is devoted to unilateral measures.

Well, first, you usually take a gift along when you go visiting. And there are a lot of guests to call on. And second—this is for those who are worried about Upper

Volta—We do NOT [published in upper case] now have another way out. We simply have nothing to give but the missiles. It is like this: Either we sit contemplating our warheads and go hungry, or we try to somehow extricate ourselves from this situation and accommodate the West's conditions. Especially in view of the fact that no one is intending to go to war with us at the moment—they too stand to lose in such a war. And if in questions of disarmament we were formerly guided by ideological considerations, now the time has come to ask ourselves the question: "And how much does all this armada cost?" And who knows, maybe if Gorbachev had resolved on such steps earlier, we might be living differently today? Not for nothing does the statement propose such measures, for example, as carrying out more modest exercises—with just 30 heavy bombers; and keeping submarines carrying ballistic missiles in port—one-half of them to begin with, and then as seems appropriate. The seven year plan for taking strategic missiles off combat alert is to be achieved in three.

As for reducing tactical nuclear weapons, here it is worth remarking that they are in the armories of virtually all the Armed Forces' combined units. One-third of sea launched and one-half of anti-aircraft warheads are to be scrapped. And no more are to be produced. And this could mean that the the Army will soon have nothing to do.

So why is all this necessary? The country must be fed. Everyone is looking forward so much to the day when we will destroy these missiles that the Americans, for example, are even ready to pay for it—after all, the destruction of missiles costs a huge amount of money, and the Russian taxpayer cannot manage it alone. All this will be subject to discussion in the president's forthcoming tour and his meetings with foreign colleagues. It is worth remarking, however, that he is hardly going to come back carrying a big check issued in exchange for missiles. In talks on this topic the West will most likely proceed on the basis of the Washington conference on coordinating aid to the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States].

The whirlwind schedule of foreign visits is amazing everyone. Five or six hours in London, then meetings scheduled by the hour in New York, and the following morning—into an airplane and a flight to the U.S. capital; from there by helicopter to Camp David, three hours with Bush there; then to Canada, and home the next morning.

We are working with the speed of rockets. And why do we need them?

'Sensational,' 'Enigmatic' Proposal

LD3001195992 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya
Ostankino Television First Program Network
in Russian 1800 GMT 30 Jan 92

[Commentary by M. Osokin; from the "Novosti" news-cast]

[Text] As First Deputy Prime Minister Burbulis recently said figuratively, Russian foreign policy should be determined by five basic principles: efficiency, dignity, accessibility, dynamism, and kindness [all five words begin with same letter in Russian]. Well, I don't know about kindness in politics, but everything seems to be in order as far as dynamism is concerned. Sensational events are following one after the other. [video shows archive film of various missiles, Yeltsin, and Kravchuk]

Russia is ceasing production of all long-range cruise missiles for the Air Force and Navy. Over 1,000 nuclear charges have been removed from combat duty, and we are proposing to the Americans to reach agreement on reducing strategic warheads to 2,000 on each side. And, perhaps, what is being most talked about is President Yeltsin's statement about excluding U.S. targets from the list of targets for Russian missiles.

This is the most sensational initiative, but also the most enigmatic. Meticulous Western politicians did not restrict themselves to expressions of joy, but immediately began to ask various questions. For example, where will these missiles be targeted now? As THE WASHINGTON POST noted, will they not simply be pointed out towards space? And some U.S. military men express doubts about the real value of such steps. They are not familiar with the mechanism of such agreements since, in practice, it is not possible to verify exactly where missiles are aimed.

It is not surprising that people in the West are impatiently awaiting Yeltsin's speech tomorrow in the UN Security Council. And all the more so since attempts to get clarifications from our military men have not been successful. It transpired that, and judging from the reactions of the generals, they, themselves, did not know the details, and Yeltsin's words about a change in strategy were rather unexpected for them.

And not just for them. For example, Ukrainian President Kravchuk says that Yeltsin did not consult him when he took the decision to review the list of missile targets. So, it seems that new details from the Russian president's speech in the Security Council are awaited with great interest by politicians and military men, not only in the West, but also in our country and in the Commonwealth countries.

Contradictions in Plan Noted

PM3001214292 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
31 Jan 92 Morning Edition p 5

[Report by Sergey Guk report on interview with Aleksandr Savelyev, participant in the Soviet-U.S. START talks, under the rubric "Express Analysis": "It Would Not Have Been a Bad Idea To Estimate Costs Before Going Public With the Superdisarmament Plan"]

[Text] That is the view of the expert Aleksandr Savelyev, participant in the Soviet-U.S. START talks, vice president of the independent Russian Institute of National

Security and Strategic Studies, and member of the London International Institute of Strategic Studies.

The Soviet [as published] disarmament proposals obviously were prepared in great haste, not everything in them had been properly thought out, and the most important thing is lacking: Will Russia's economy gain by the forthcoming supercuts, or, on the contrary, will it be unable to withstand the additional expenditure, running into billions, that has fallen to its lot?

In Bush's case, Savelyev stated, there are four clearly identified arms reduction items that eventually will give the United States \$50 billion. In Yeltsin's case, there are any number of such points, but there is not a word about savings, and this prompts dispiriting thoughts: Did anyone make any elementary economic calculations? What will the elimination of these not insubstantial arsenals cost and will Russia derive any benefit? If so, how much and when?

No, Boris Yeltsin's idea does not in itself provoke a negative attitude in our expert. He only cannot eliminate the feeling that the package of proposals bears the stamp of some degree of haste and lack of forethought. As if the president's speech was drafted at the last moment, after information had leaked out on Bush's intention to put forward a unilateral disarmament initiative, and the speech writers were given a familiar command: Catch up and overtake America.

Aleksandr Savelyev's feelings are based on facts. Here is one: Boris Yeltsin promises to reduce to three years the seven year timetable for the implementation of the START Treaty. Why? This is not going to reduce the costs—and they run to billions. Worse: The expenditure will be incurred in the most crucial years of the economic reform, when every million counts.

What need is there to take on unmanageable enhanced countercommitments for eliminating strategic offensive arms ahead of schedule? Is it in order to demonstrate our peaceableness? Or in the hope of receiving additional benefits of some kind from the West by way of reward? But the United States and its allies are ready to help us anyway, and they will not give us more than they can afford, however fast we disarm.

Furthermore, by destroying delivery vehicles without due forethought we could, in our haste, inflict a crushing blow on the environment, especially as we have no shortage of experience in that department: The destruction of medium-range missiles by blowing them up led to considerable pollution of the soil and water resources and livestock deaths. Add to that the accelerated elimination of thousands of weapons (world science has yet to invent a better method of destroying them than underground nuclear explosions)—and the full extent of the problem becomes clear.

Our expert also pointed to some highly enigmatic points in the Russian president's speech. For instance, the point about our commitment to the ABM Treaty was followed promptly, with no transitional passage, by the point

about the Russian leadership's desire to develop a global defense system together with the United States. But the treaty and global defense are mutually exclusive: Before you can talk about universal defense, you first have to replace the ABM Treaty with a new agreement. One suspects that the text of the speech was prepared by old apparatchiks, who are old hands at peace initiatives and are more concerned with the propaganda side of the matter than with logic and common sense.

The statement also mentioned the problem of strategic stability and the need to strengthen it. In our expert's view this hardly is compatible with one of the proposed steps—ending submarine combat patrols. Whichever way you look at it, the naval component is the most invulnerable part of the strategic triad, and is therefore regarded as a stabilizing factor. And keeping the submarines moored (so that they become accessible targets) will only produce the opposite effect.

Our expert sees the reason for this initiative as most likely being the shortage of resources. In which case, where does strategic stability come into it? And it is pointless to expect the pragmatic Americans to reciprocate, in a sudden fit of generosity.

Aleksandr Savelyev's answer to the traditional question—have we made more concessions and undermined our own security?—was a resolute "no." Despite all the reductions, he assured us, we still have tremendous might—sufficient to destroy the whole world. So, in that respect, you can rest easy. Here another question is more apposite: How carefully considered are our disarmament moves?

In the speech we once again heard the thesis on Russia's commitment to the principle of reasonable sufficiency, which our ears have been buzzing with in recent years. Only Eduard Shevardnadze once had the courage to admit that no one in our country really knows what it means. We have no criteria. Sufficiency—for what? For defense against whom? What threat are we expecting? There are no answers, but nonetheless everyone unites in swearing loyalty to this principle.

Will the world become safer following the implementation of the two presidents' plans? Certainly, our expert is convinced: What we have here is not only good intentions as regards disarmament, but concrete steps to reduce the nuclear missile risk. And another optimistic point: These steps are unilateral, and therefore their implementation does not require special talks to be held. Because there is no better way to ruin any initiative than to start talks: The experts can argue for years about levels and sublevels, hedge the reductions about with countless conditions and reservations, and drag things out endlessly.

You can believe the participant in the START talks: He knows what he is talking about.

Confusion Over Yeltsin Plan Alleged

LD3001223792 Moscow Russian Television Network
in Russian 2000 GMT 30 Jan 92

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] A spokesman for the General Staff of the Commonwealth Armed Forces told journalists in the presence of an official of the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs today that the military is pleased with the cuts in the Army.

[Correspondent A. Peslayk] As Ilya Nabatov said, in the paper this morning and at a news conference this evening, representatives of the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and of the General Staff of the combined Armed Forces of the CIS attempted to decipher what Yeltsin said and what his printed words meant. But try as they might, they weren't very successful. It is difficult to make a disarmament initiative tangible, and the spokesmen were rather vague. [video shows speakers addressing journalists]

Asked what sum could be saved, and where the money would go, Ambassador Obukhov referred to the promises of military economists. No central body for reductions exists as yet. Although everyone knows that the government and the ministry are responsible for this, there is no such body. Let us single out a few things. First, a comparison between the counter-initiatives of Yeltsin and Bush reflects the priority of reducing military budgets as a whole and nuclear weapons in the first instance. Both we and the Americans are halting production of heavy bombers and the development of strategic missiles, and we are eliminating certain types of tactical nuclear weapons. But, secondly, the Yeltsin initiative is wider and more comprehensive, and embraces all aspects of the disarmament process and the whole range of nuclear armaments—strategic and tactical, on land, at sea, and in the air. Third, the initiatives are aimed at a radical reduction of our military potential.

The new initiatives were cited more often than explained at the news conference. Journalists listened and asked, but the ideas hung in the air. The period of yes-men is past, but there is clearly a lack of readiness for lively presentation!

'Breakthrough' in Thinking

PM3101100692 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 31 Jan 92 p 3

[Report by ITAR-TASS correspondent V. Smelov: "Breakthrough in Military-Strategic Thinking"]

[Text] Vienna, 30 Jan—Russian President Boris Yeltsin's statement "On Russia's Policy in the Sphere of Arms Limitation and Reduction" was assessed highly at the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces in Europe. The text has been disseminated among the delegations of the countries taking part in this forum, at which a plenary session was held.

Vladimir Shustov, head of the Russian delegation, who spoke at the session, stressed that it is a question of large-scale initiatives aimed at finally overcoming the consequences of the policy of confrontation and cold war and achieving radical progress in strengthening stability and security. He said that it is important that Russia's initiatives do not only touch on the quantitative parameters of its military potential. They "herald a breakthrough in military-strategic thinking, opening up the way to overcoming the doctrine of nuclear deterrence and totally eliminating nuclear weapons."

The U.S. President's statement, which sets forth a program of major cuts in the U.S. nuclear potential, "indicates that it is realistic to achieve these goals in the process of the development of relations of partnership, if not alliance, between the nuclear powers and all interested states in their efforts aimed at creating a stable and secure world order," the diplomat believes.

Dwelling on the provisions of the Russian Federation president's statement that relate directly to the Vienna talks, V. Shustov stressed that Russia reaffirms at the highest level the USSR's specific commitments in the sphere of arms limitation and reduction.

Kazakhstan Welcomes Initiatives

OW3101121992 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1050 GMT 31 Jan 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Kazakhstan has welcomed Russia's disarmament initiatives put forward by President Yeltsin on Wednesday [29 January]. A statement issued Friday [31 January] by the press-service of President Nazarbayev's office points out that "the wish to see nuclear weapons totally eliminated is one of the major goals of Kazakhstan's policy".

The statement says that Kazakhstan supports Russia's "essentially sound" stand toward the gradual elimination of nuclear weapons on parity basis. Nevertheless, the statement says, Kazakhstan, as part of the former Soviet Union, "has for dozens of years produced nuclear weapons and developed a corresponding infrastructure", the fact that should be viewed as "a historic reality which cannot be ignored". The presidential press-service pointed to the need for working out a unified defense concept for all member states of the Commonwealth "which has not been done yet". It also said that "progressive ideas expressed by the head of the Russian Federation need in some points clearer definitions and should be coordinated with all CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] member states".

Gorbachev Says 'Important Step'

LD3001173992 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1653 GMT 30 Jan 92

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Aleksandr Krasulin]

[Text] Moscow, 30 Jan (ITAR-TASS)—"The specific measures on arms limitation and reduction proposed by the president of Russia are an important step in the right direction," Mikhail Gorbachev, president of the Socio-Economic and Political Research Foundation, told an ITAR-TASS correspondent today. "I welcome the new initiatives in one of the decisive areas of the movement toward a new world order, and see in them a continuation of what was done for many years in the framework of the new political thinking and yet more proof of the historic importance of the breakthrough in Soviet-U.S. relations, which has had fundamental consequences for all global development."

Mikhail Gorbachev commented that the complicated processes in the Commonwealth of Independent States and the threat of a weakening of control over nuclear weapons have made new steps in the disarmament sphere especially topical. It is easier to make them today, "because the way has already been paved".

"I do not know the details of the plans which Boris Yeltsin has taken to the United States," Mikhail Gorbachev said. "I hope they have been worked on professionally." He also remarked that George Bush's and Boris Yeltsin's proposals "do not dovetail very much, at first glance". In Gorbachev's opinion, some of them, even those which sound identical, need to be finalized with specific examination by negotiations. The business of coordinating them and matching them to each other is a task for specialists, with the direct participation of politicians. Obviously, serious work lies ahead in Camp David, Mikhail Gorbachev stressed.

Bush Declaration of Cold War Victory Noted

PM3001162792 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
30 Jan 92 p 4

[Correspondent Vladislav Drobkov report: "George Bush: America Has Won the Cold War. U.S. President Delivers State of the Union Message"]

[Excerpt] Washington, 29 Jan—When he appeared in the U.S. Congress last night, President George Bush looked sure of himself, of his party, and of the support of Americans. At one moment he would joke, at another he would reach the heights of passion, or yet again he would lecture his listeners patriotically. Millions of Americans were listening to the head of the Republican administration. The President was delivering his traditional State of the Union message.

George Bush began with what he knew in advance was a winning theme for Americans, the changes in the world which, in his words, were of "biblical proportions" and had made the United States the only superpower. "This year communism died...America won the 'cold war,'" the President declared to the audience's wild applause.

Now, for the first time in 30 years, our strategic bombers are not in a state of round-the-clock combat alert, and

there is no need for schoolchildren to hide at the sound of the school bell signalling an air raid, as my children did, he said.

George Bush also recalled the victory of U.S. arms in the war against Iraq, whose anniversary is being celebrated with pomp in the United States at the moment, as well as the beginning of the Arab-Israeli dialogue, and the return home of the last U.S. hostage. "The world which was earlier divided into two camps," he emphasized, "has gained a single power standing above the others—the United States of America."

Guided by all these changes on the world stage, the United States can now move toward making a significant reduction in its defense efforts. "Today," George Bush declared, "I can report dramatic changes in our strategic nuclear forces to you."

He reported the following:

- when production of the 20 B-2 aircraft already on order is completed, the bombers' manufacture will be halted;
- the program to develop small ICBM's will be canceled;
- production of new warheads for sea-launched ballistic missiles will stop;
- manufacture of the new Peacekeeper nuclear missiles has been stopped;
- procurement of any improved cruise missiles will cease.

"I will meet Boris Yeltsin of the Russian Federation at the end of this week at Camp David," the U.S. President went on. "I will inform President Yeltsin that if the Commonwealth, the former Soviet Union, destroys all land-based ballistic missiles with multiple warheads, I will do the following: We will destroy all Peacekeeper missiles, reduce to one the number of warheads on Minuteman missiles, reduce by one-third the number of warheads on our sea-launched missiles, and convert a sizeable proportion of our strategic bombers for mainly nonnuclear use."

At the same time the President called for vigilance because the world still remains a dangerous place, and while yesterday's challenges are behind us, new ones are coming into being. Having reported on the decision to reduce U.S. military spending in the next five years by \$50 billion, he firmly declared that he would not proceed to make bigger reductions. Bush mentioned at the same time his intention to try and obtain Congressional support to finance the program to protect the United States against a limited nuclear missile attack. "We should possess this defense because too many people in too many countries have access to nuclear weapons, and I call upon you to approve SDI," he stated. [passage omitted]

Arms Initiatives in State of the Union Message Summarized*PM3001172592 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 Jan 92 p 1*

[Report by TASS correspondent A. Fedyashin: "George Bush: The United States Intends To Speed up the Change in Structure of Its Strategic Forces"]

[Text] Washington—U.S. President George Bush delivered the traditional State of the Union message to Congress on 28 January. In it the American President touched on a number of very important aspects of U.S. military policy and said, in particular, the following:

"I have already informed President Yeltsin that if the Commonwealth, the former Soviet Union, eliminates all ground-launched ballistic missiles with multiple warheads, I will do the following:

"We will scrap all Peacekeeper missiles. We will reduce the number of warheads on Minuteman missiles to one per missile and will reduce the number of warheads on our sea-launched missiles by roughly one-third. We will also convert a considerable proportion of our strategic bombers to basically conventional (nonnuclear—TASS correspondent's note) planes."

The U.S. President reported that the administration intends to "speed up" unilaterally the implementation of radical changes in the structure of the U.S. strategic forces and the reduction of America's military expenditure, but is far from intending to recklessly follow this path.

The unilateral measures announced by the President include the following:

- the administration renounces the full-scale implementation of the new B-2 strategic bomber's construction program. Instead of the 75 planes planned, only 20 will be manufactured;
- the United States cancels the program to create a new small ICBM. Instead of this the guidance system for existing Minuteman missiles will be modernized;
- the Department of Energy is ceasing production of the new W-88 warheads for American Trident strategic submarines;
- the Pentagon will stop purchasing new modern cruise missiles after 1992. It is planned to purchase 640 of them instead of the previously intended 1,000 by the end of 1992.

The President also reported that his administration intends in the coming five years to "save an extra \$50 billion on defense expenditure," adding that, consequently, total military expenditure savings since he came into office will amount to 30 percent by Fiscal Year 1997. However, the cuts in military programs and defense budgets announced by Bush lag way behind the demands of the Democrats and even a number of Republicans in Congress, who consider that Washington can

and should cut defense expenditure in the next five-seven years by \$75 billion, \$100 billion, or even \$210 billion.

The U.S. President stated that now, with the collapse of communism and America's "victory" in the "cold war", the United States can allow itself to look after its own affairs, to stop "making sacrifices," and to start tackling in earnest its domestic economic and social problems.

GENERAL**U.S. Money for CIS Disarmament 'Insufficient'***PM2801125992 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Jan 92 Morning Edition p 5*

[Article by Stanislav Kondrashov: "Dollars for Nuclear Disarmament Seek Employment in CIS States"]

[Text] "Is this a gift?" Ambassador Aleksey Obukhov tried to ascertain. U.S. Under Secretary of State Reginald Bartholomew replied in a very American manner: "I do not like the word 'gift.' Regard it as an investment."

As has already been reported repeatedly, Washington is prepared to invest (gratis!) \$400 million in the more rapid and guaranteed, albeit far from complete (the sum is insufficient), destruction of nuclear weapons, which, although they have become former Soviet weapons, have not become former weapons. The U.S. Congress set aside appropriations last November. The Bush administration took up the idea, and Mr. Bartholomew was entrusted with fleshing it out, which is what he did by coming to Moscow 15 January, then visiting Kiev and Minsk, and leaving Alma-Ata for Brussels 22 January in order to brief the NATO allies on his trip on the way home.

The Russian Foreign Ministry is now awaiting the information promised by Bartholomew on his talks in the three other CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] capitals. Communications with them in Moscow are not as good as over the usual line with Washington. However, experts from the diplomatic departments of all (or almost all) the Commonwealth states are meeting in Moscow on Monday, 27 January. They will define and share out the obligations inherited under the USSR's treaties. Of course, the subject of the \$400 million will feature among others. It has to be thought that, following the under secretary of state's trip, the process of implementation will move quickly in Washington, taking the form of a specific plan for direct financial assistance in eliminating nuclear charges.

Time is pressing. The removal of charges for tactical nuclear weapons from Ukraine and Belarus to prepared installations in Russia is to be completed by 1 July this year. There they will be prepared for destruction in accordance with the pledges given by Mikhail Gorbachev, who responded last October to Bush's initiative in the same sphere. Assistance is needed in terms of means of transport and the creation of additional storage premises. Nuclear charges for artillery shells, mines, and

ground-based tactical missiles will be removed in full by the end of January. Next in line are air defense missiles, "air-to-surface" missiles, and naval missiles.

The Soviet obligations under the Treaty on the Reduction of Strategic Nuclear Arms are also being fulfilled at a preferential rate. For example, of the 503 ICBM's taken off alert status, 130 have been removed from the silos and 68 eliminated.

Alas, \$400 million is not that large an investment. According to one of our expert assessments, Russia has a need for five special warehouses for the safe keeping of fissionable nuclear materials. The approximate cost of each one is \$500 million. We are getting to know a new reality: costly disarmament as the final phase of stupendously expensive superarmament.

Russia is the USSR's successor as regards the earlier adopted pledges to reduce arms. Changes of policy are expected here only in the direction of a faster pace and greater volumes. Boris Yeltsin will evidently speak of this on the day of his debut in the UN Security Council—31 January. An earlier occasion cannot be ruled out either—by way of preparing for his visit to London, New York, and Washington.

The disarmament race is no less infectious than the arms race. Particularly when the epoch of global Soviet-U.S. rivalry is so obviously behind us. The U.S. press carries references to a hush-hush report prepared for the commander of the U.S. Strategic Air Forces. Radicalizing the U.S. obligations under the treaty on the reduction of offensive nuclear arms, the authors propose, instead of the present approximately 11,000 units, just 5,000 plus or minus 20 percent. A special commission formed under the U.S. National Academy of Sciences goes further: 3,000—4,000 strategic warheads, and then 1,000-2,000.

This is not yet official policy but an authoritative sign of the direction in which it will change. Russia will hardly be alone in accelerating the historic race toward nuclear disarmament. If things proceed normally, additions to the \$400 million will be needed.

What is needed for normality in our present stormy circumstances is reliable control over nuclear weapons, as well as strict observance of their nonproliferation regime. This key question was also discussed in detail at the meetings in Moscow, where Aleksey Obukhov sat at the head of a group of Russian experts opposite his old partner, Bartholomew.

The West proceeds from the premise that just one nuclear state—Russia—can remain, as previously, on the territory of the disintegrated Union. In the Minsk agreement Ukraine and Belarus confirmed their desire to be nuclear-free states. Ukraine intends to be fully rid of nuclear weapons by the end of 1994. Kazakhstan avoids being definite as to deadlines but is prepared to fulfill its share of the obligations under the treaty on strategic offensive arms—which means eliminating the nuclear weapons on its territory by 1998.

It has been learned that Bartholomew agreed in principle with the procedure proposed by the Russian side for bringing the treaty on strategic offensive arms into force. Russia is ratifying it, while the other three CIS states which have nuclear weapons on their territory approve of the treaty. A juridical nicety—not ratification [ratifikatsiya] but approval [odobreniye]—means that Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Belarus avoid the politically sensitive status of a "quasinuclear state" and ensures that they subscribe to the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons as nuclear-free states.

So, a new accommodation is taking place in nuclear questions—with regard to the emergence of the CIS. Looking from Moscow, this is, above all, an accommodation between Russia, which is emerging into the mainstream of international life, and the West, between Russia and the other Commonwealth states. U.S. dollars for our nuclear disarmament are one of the episodes of this process.

Commentaries on Yeltsin Missile Targeting Announcement

Statement 'Raises Questions'

PM2901140192 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
29 Jan 92 p 5

[Anatoliy Karpychev "Viewpoint": "What is the Target?"]

[Text] Russian President B.N. Yeltsin's statement that the former USSR's nuclear missiles will no longer be targeted on U.S. cities was the main news item of the day. That comment was made in an interview on ABC TV and consequently, as so often in the past, we learned about the statement in our country from the foreign mass media and, to be honest, it was somewhat vexing that the president did not give us the news first.

The fact that our missiles and the Americans' were targeted, especially during the cold war years, was clear to everyone. Propagandists used this almost physical sense of threat—both from the other side and from ours—to formulate their "theory of fear" which often determined the superpowers' decisions. When discussion turned to giving us aid, I well remember how U.S. Defense Secretary Cheney warned that there is no need to hurry with aid because there is no very great desire to do this when there are 27,000 nuclear weapons sited on USSR territory. And since the West did not ask us for aid we cannot criticize it because its missiles are targeted on us.

The Russian president's statement raises a number of questions. The first is this. Henceforth, U.S. cities will not be a target for Soviet nuclear missiles, which is reasonable, but will Soviet cities remain a target for U.S. warheads? Will it not be the same as with the secret devices which Vadim Bakatin presented as a "gift" to the Americans? I am not asking that we be given something back in Washington for those devices, the main thing is the rules of the game.

Judging from the first official reports, the United States is not disposed to change anything. White House spokesman Fitzwater has said that this step by President Yeltsin "is important and very positive." "People believe the president" and hope to receive more detailed information from him. At the same time, Fitzwater noted, the United States is not retargeting its nuclear weapons aimed at the Commonwealth of Independent States. Why? The U.S. side "cannot ignore the fact that the scale of the former Soviet Union's nuclear arsenal has still not undergone significant change and the targets of these weapons cannot be determined from independent sources."

The second question is this: What are we going to target now? Not the desert, surely? I rang the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] Armed Forces main command. They told me:

"The missiles will be targeted on installations of military significance which represent a real military threat."

'Mixed' Western Response Seen

PM2901144192 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
29 Jan 92 morning Edition p 5

[Report by Aleksandr Krivopalov and Aleksandr Sychev: "Fewer Nuclear Targets, Less Risk"]

[Text] President Yeltsin's initiative put forward in an interview for ABC TV on excluding U.S. cities from the list of installations targeted by the strategic nuclear missiles under Russian control has met with a positive response in Washington. The president's press secretary, M. Fitzwater, set out the U.S. position.

"We welcome any steps aimed at reducing the threat and risk for the United States and its allies from the states of the former Soviet Union," he said. "In this connection the Russian president's statement is an important and very positive step in that direction."

Washington expressed confidence that matters will turn out exactly as the Russian president says but does not plan a reciprocal move yet. U.S. strategic missiles will not be retargeted and the cities of the former Soviet Union will remain a target for a nuclear strike even though we are no longer considered a U.S. "potential enemy."

What is going on? M. Fitzwater explained the U.S. position by saying that his country cannot verify the Russian missiles' actual targets on the basis of independent sources and that the scale of the former USSR's strategic nuclear potential has not undergone significant change as yet. However, the president's press secretary did not rule out the possibility that the United States will adopt similar measures in the future.

UK Defense Secretary King also expressed approval of Yeltsin's statement but noted that Britain's "nuclear deterrent potential" will be preserved at the minimum necessary level but in the future it will be possible to discuss reducing it, too.

On the whole, the reaction in the world to the Russian initiative has been very mixed and it is hard to say whether it aroused greater satisfaction or anxiety. The fact is that the question of new targets for the strategic missiles thus released has not been decided, which intensified the nonnuclear world's concern caused by the statement of U.S. Defense Secretary Cheney. Some time ago the Pentagon head talked about the need to be ready for the possibility that there could be far more nuclear powers in the world than there are today. The United States must maintain its strategic weapons so that no one considers delivering a nuclear strike against the United States. From this assumption he concluded that new targets for the U.S. missiles around the world should be determined.

Thus the two largest nuclear powers are looking for new targets because the Soviet missiles thus released have not been aimed toward space. THE WASHINGTON POST writes. Because of the uncertainty over this question, an article in the BERLINER ZEITUNG writes, the old distrust will grow on new soil elsewhere in the world.

The first symptoms of distrust have already appeared in Japan, where the U.S. ambassador needed to refute a report from the KYODO news agency citing a report allegedly prepared by the U.S. Joint Strategic Target Planning Staff [obyedinennyy komitet opredeleniya tseley strategicheskikh sil], which names Japan, Germany, India, China, North Korea, Iraq, Iran, Libya, Algeria, and South Africa among the list of targets.

The U.S. ambassador seemed to quell this source of distrust by giving an assurance that the U.S. allies are under the protection of America's "nuclear umbrella." But the far more serious problem connected with the Nuclear Weapon Nonproliferation Treaty remains unresolved. Neither the Russian nor the U.S. governments said anything about that when putting forward their plans for the future.

Ukraine's Kravchuk 'Not Consulted'

LD2801170192 Moscow TASS in English
1615 GMT 28 Jan 92

[by TASS correspondent Aleksey Golyayev]

[Excerpts] Rome January 28 TASS—"Russians and Ukrainians will never fight. We shall reach agreement on all problems", Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk said in an interview with the Italian newspaper "LA REPUBBLICA." [passage omitted]

The Ukrainian president said that Yeltsin did not consult him when deciding that nuclear missiles deployed on Russian territory will no longer be targeted on American cities. No one of the presidents of Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Belarus can adopt on his own a decision to use nuclear weapons, no matter where they are stationed. But each state is pursuing its own policy. It is for the Russian Government to decide where missiles in Russia are targeted. [passage omitted]

SRF Explanation Cited

*PM2701154092 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
28 Jan 92 Morning Edition p 1*

[Viktor Litovkin report: "Boris Yeltsin: Our Missiles Will Not Be Targeted on U.S. Cities. The Missilemen of the Commonwealth Strategic Forces Await the Order"]

[Text] Russian President Boris Yeltsin's sensational statement in an ABC television interview that from Monday 27 January this year Russian nuclear missiles will cease to be targeted on U.S. cities has prompted many commentaries.

Some of the mass media took this announcement as a promise by the Russian president that our missiles will not be targeted on America at all, and asked: Then where will they be targeted—into space, into the deserts, or on what other countries and cities?

IZVESTIYA's correspondent asked the experts for an explanation. At the Strategic Rocket Forces [SRF] Main Staff they reminded me that this initiative is by no means the first by our country in the sphere of strategic disarmament. Last October we pledged unilaterally to remove from alert status 503 ICBM's equipped with a total of 1,154 nuclear warheads. We removed from alert status all heavy bombers armed with cruise missiles, stopped work on programs for the creation of mobile small ICBM's and modernized short-range nuclear missiles for heavy bombers and the modernization of ICBM's for railroad missile systems, and amended the schedule for reducing strategic offensive arms down to a total level of 5,000 weapons (instead of 6,000 under the START Treaty).

These same initiatives set the following time scale for the completion of the elimination of tactical nuclear weapons: for the Navy—1995; for nuclear warheads on antiaircraft missiles—1996; for nuclear mines—1998; and for nuclear warheads on tactical missiles and nuclear artillery shells—2000.

But this timetable has even now been revised. All tactical nuclear weapons are to be withdrawn from the Ukraine by 1 July this year, and they are already being withdrawn. The same process has begun in Belarus. All these tactical nuclear weapons, in compliance with the Agreement on Strategic Forces Between the Commonwealth Member States, will be destroyed with the participation of the Republic of Belarus, the Russian Federation, and the Ukraine, with joint verification.

Moreover, at the Minsk meeting 30 December last year it was decided to remove strategic nuclear weapons entirely from Ukrainian territory by the end of 1994, and to dismantle them. Strategic nuclear weapons are to be withdrawn from the territory of the Republic of Belarus in 1996-1997.

The Soviet military hope that all these steps—and they were no simple or easy matter for us (seven years are allowed for the fulfillment of the START Treaty alone, yet here this enormous work will have to be carried out

in practice in just over two years)—should prompt an appropriate response from our partners. Not only the Americans, but also the French and the British—the leadership of all those countries that possess strategic nuclear weapons and whose missiles are not, of course, targeted on outer space.

Disarmament, Soviet experts believe, should follow an agreed path, be built on parity principles, and allow no one any advantages. That is the guarantee of international stability.

As for the Russian president's new initiative, the strategic missilemen told IZVESTIYA's correspondent that it would be a fine thing for the relaxation of international tension if the missiles of all the members of the nuclear club were targeted not on cities with a population of many millions, but for the time being only on missile bases and arsenals, missile launchers, missile assembly plants, control centers, and other similar targets. The Soviet missilemen are prepared to fulfill their leadership's orders. Admittedly, technically this will take a certain time, several days at least. But if they receive a directive [ukazaniye] to that effect from the Russian president, then it will certainly be adopted for implementation.

While IZVESTIYA's correspondent was talking with experts at the Strategic Missile Forces Main Staff, everyone was waiting for Boris Yeltsin to deliver a statement on Russia's new defensive doctrine. Let us hope that this will cast more light on his statement to ABC television beforehand.

'Fundamental Change in Strategy'

*PM2801100592 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 28 Jan 92 p 1*

[Aleksandr Golts report: "Russian President B.N. Yeltsin: 'We Want To Change Our Military Doctrine'"]

[Text] The nuclear disarmament "race" has taken another turn, perhaps the most breathtaking to date. In an interview with the U.S. ABC television company, Russian President B. Yeltsin announced that intercontinental ballistic missiles under Russian control would soon no longer be aimed any cities in the United States. "We want to change our military doctrine," the president stated, "and no longer view the United States as our potential adversary." B. Yeltsin said that he intends to make an official statement on this score 27 January, and repeat it at the 31 January session of the leaders of the member states of the UN Security Council. The U.S. President has already been informed of Russia's decision.

It should be mentioned that G. Bush will also not be coming empty-handed to this session, which is devoted to strengthening security on the planet in the new conditions. According to U.S. press reports, substantial changes in U.S. strategic planning will be announced. In particular, there is a suggestion that already today, in his annual "State of the Union" message to Congress, Bush will announce the giving up of land-based MX strategic

missiles and a significant proportion of the "Trident" sea-launched missiles. Work on the new "Midgetman" intercontinental missile will be halted. The U.S. Department of Energy will halt production of nuclear warheads.

And so, we are possibly witness to a fundamental change in military strategy, the basis of which for the last four decades has been the military confrontation of the USSR and the United States. And now the two largest nuclear powers, having given up the long, and not always productive talks and acting unilaterally on the basis of setting a good example, are eliminating the material means of confrontation—their nuclear-missile potential. The threat which only yesterday hung over mankind, the threat of nuclear war, is diminishing before our very eyes. The new initiatives are especially important now, when mankind is passing through a most important critical moment. On the one hand, B. Yeltsin's initiative enables the fears of Western countries concerning the fate of the former USSR's nuclear potential to be lifted to a significant degree. And on the other, G. Bush's reciprocal initiative enables Russia to do this without feeling concern about its own security.

However, at the present time it is not just the readiness of Moscow and Washington to reduce nuclear arsenals that is of great significance, but also their ability to maintain strategic stability. And it has to be said that such a fundamental change in strategic planning may provoke by no means only worldwide approval, but also some misgivings. I will cite just one example. So much information has appeared in U.S. newspapers about the Pentagon experts' review of their strategic goals that it has served as the basis for all kinds of speculation. KYODO reported that experts are proposing to aim missiles away from the former USSR and to target them on other countries possessing, or able to possess, weapons of mass destruction. This list allegedly includes not only China, India, the DPRK, Iraq, Iran, Libya, Algeria, and the Republic of South Africa, but even Japan and Germany.

I suspect that similar questions may arise with regard to our missiles also. Indeed, what is to be their future if they are no longer aimed at U.S. cities? I personally think that B. Yeltsin's decision does not mean that our nuclear missile systems will be re-aimed at some other targets. But in that case, we are in effect talking about taking a significant part of the nuclear missile potential off alert status.

At the same time, let us not forget that, according to the Alma-Ata agreements, the strategic potential of the former USSR is viewed as a means of ensuring the security of all the member states of the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States]. And in conditions where the future of the Armed Forces remains extremely hazy, the strategic deterrence forces are virtually the only means of maintaining defensive capabilities. Has Moscow conducted consultations on this question with the nuclear and nonnuclear republics of the CIS? And

what, in that case, is to be the future of the strategic missiles deployed on the territory of the Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan?

Unfortunately, in line with the worst traditions of Soviet foreign policy, once more we learned of the cardinal new changes in military strategy from foreign mass media reports. Has this question been analyzed by our military experts, and if so, to what degree? My colleague Colonel A. Belousov, editor of the Rocket Forces and Air Defense Forces Combat Training desk, phoned a representative of the Strategic Rocket Forces Main Staff, in order to discover their reaction to the Russian president's initiative. It was just as the reaction of military men should be: The decision about where the missiles are aimed, they said there, is not made by the Rocket Forces Command, but by the political leadership. As for the technical side of the matter, it is of course, an extremely complex question, and requires deep study and analysis. At the same time, specialists believe, it is important to see that parity is maintained.

U.S. Welcomes Yeltsin Offer

LD2701195692 Moscow TASS in English 1942 GMT
27 Jan 92

[Text] Washington January 27 TASS—"We welcome any measures that reduce the threat and risks to the United States and our allies from the states of the former Soviet Union," White House spokesman Marlin Fitzwater told ABC news today.

"President Yeltsin's reported statements on targeting appear to be a very important and positive step in that direction and we look forward to hearing details," he said.

He commented on Yeltsin's statement in an ABC interview that Russia-controlled strategic nuclear missiles would no longer be targeted on the United States.

"We believe him and look forward to hearing the details," Fitzwater emphasised.

At the same time the White House spokesman said the United States was not changing the targeting of its nuclear weapons on CIS countries. This is connected with the fact that the U.S. side "Cannot, however, ignore the fact that the size of the nuclear arsenal of the former Soviet Union has not yet changed substantially. The targeting for those weapons cannot be independently verified".

However, the presidential press secretary did not rule out the possibility of similar U.S. measures in the future, pointing out that the U.S. might take such a decision when it possesses appropriate information and data and only when, in U.S. view, that would be appropriate.

'Dramatic' Announcement Praised

LD2701160292 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service
in English 1210 GMT 27 Jan 92

[Commentary by Yuriy Solton]

[Text] President Boris Yeltsin has said that Russia's intercontinental ballistic missiles will soon not be targeted at any city in the United States. Yuriy Solton comments:

The statement is dramatic. It spells out a fundamental change in the nuclear doctrine. As a matter of fact, Russia is in the process of abandoning the doctrine of mutual nuclear deterrent which has maintained the strategic balance ever since World War II.

It was not the Soviet Union who started the nuclear arms race. The Pentagon's plans, declassified today, have confirmed that Moscow's fears about a risk of nuclear strikes against large Soviet cities and military facilities were justified. However, it was no other than the Soviet Union who, in January 1986, announced its intention to build a nuclear-free and safe world, and put forward specific proposals to that effect.

Until recently that statement was dismissed as propaganda. These days this idea has begun taking shape. The clock of history, which came close to the doomsday mark, has been set back. Soviet and U.S. nuclear missiles of intermediate and shorter range have been scrapped. A treaty limiting and reducing strategic offensive arms has been signed. Both Washington and Moscow have said that they will go further and that most tactical nuclear arms will be scrapped.

Yet even after all that, the White House kept complaining that the nuclear missiles of the two countries are still targeted at their original targets.

And now, there comes Moscow's statement that not a single big city in the United States will be a target for Russian missiles. Russia's leadership has confirmed once again that it no longer considers the United States as its potential enemy and that it is going to cooperate with America in building a new, safe world order.

However, all that may prove easier said than done. A number of serious questions are still to be answered. For instance, what can pacify the hawks in the armed forces of the Commonwealth of Independent States, the successor of the Soviet Union? What role is going to be played by the strategic forces? And one more question—probably the most important of all—what kind of response will come from the United States?

The first signs have been encouraging. As he will address a joint session of both houses of the U.S. Congress on Tuesday [28 January] with the State of the Union message, President Bush is expected to declare a major cut in U.S. strategic nuclear potential, including the strategic forces. The WASHINGTON POST says for the first time ever since the beginning of the nuclear age the United States will stop the production of all nuclear warheads and refrain from developing new ones. U.S. tactical nuclear warheads are being moved to the facilities where they will be scrapped. However, U.S. strategic missiles are still targeted against Russia and other former Soviet republics.

When they meet at Camp David on the first of next month, President Bush and President Yeltsin will have a chance to coordinate the process of nuclear disarmament. However, it has already become clear that the nuclear disarmament steps Moscow and Washington have been taking will make the world a safer place.

Yeltsin, Major Hold 'Honest, Frank Dialogue'

*LD3001180992 Moscow TASS in English
1641 GMT 30 Jan 92*

[By ITAR-TASS correspondents Dmitriy Voskobonikov and Yuriy Levchenko]

[Excerpts] London January 30 TASS—Great Britain and Russia "reached progress on the path of building new relations", British Prime Minister John Major told reporters on Thursday [30 January] after a four-hour meeting with visiting Russian President Boris Yeltsin.

Major, who was speaking right outside his residence, said both countries were always interested in promoting better relations, but today the general values of democracy, of a free economy, peace and stability add new impetus to the relations. The prime minister welcomed the latest Russian disarmament moves and said the nuclear deterrence force should exist at a low level and be based on the most stable systems. Great Britain will maintain a minimum of strategic deterrence force which will not threaten anyone, according to Major. He praised the Russo-British declaration, which was signed today, saying it may become the basis of an official treaty on bilateral relations which may be concluded in the near future. Great Britain will support the forces of democracy in Russia, will promote its joining the International Monetary Fund and will continue to insist that Russia is allowed to postpone its foreign debt payments, according to Major. The British Government will grant 280 million pounds sterling in export credits to Russia in 1992 and will suggest the European Community to conclude a trade and economic agreement with Russia, the prime minister said. Great Britain will also help Russia eliminate nuclear weapons liable for destruction and will send a group of experts to Moscow to solve technical details, Major added.

Russia will also get British help in other military fields, including the restructuring of the Armed Forces according to the needs of a democratic society, Major said, adding he agreed with the Russian president they should establish a reliable and direct communication link between themselves. Consultations on the peaceful use of the talent of Russian military scientists will continue, according to him. [passage omitted]

Speaking to reporters, John Major said he had no doubts that Russia, led by Boris Yeltsin, will continue its disarmament work, especially in superpower relations.

In turn, Yeltsin said that he respected the British position on its deterrent forces. "We do not want to debate this subject, or speculate on it in the mass media," he said. The military doctrine of the former Soviet Union

should be changed "as well as the direction towards which our remaining missiles will be aimed", Yeltsin said. [passage omitted]

NUCLEAR & SPACE ARMS TALKS

Moscow Nuclear Risk Reduction Center Profiled
924P0061A *Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA*
in Russian 29 Jan 92 p 2

[Interview with Lt Gen Vladimir Medvedev, director of the National Nuclear Risk Reduction Center, conducted by Vladimir Shchedrin: "How to Get Rid of—Missiles"; conducted in Moscow; date not given]

[Text] [Shchedrin] This organization is located practically in the very center of Moscow, but not many people know of its existence. The building does not have a flashy sign, and there are no limousines hanging around its entrance. And only someone who is specifically expected can get in.

I will not tease your curiosity any longer. I have been referring to the Nuclear Risk Reduction Center [NRRC], which works around the clock. Its accomplishments include the implementation of the Treaty on Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles [INF Treaty]. As of today, all Soviet and American missiles in that class and their launchers have been eliminated—2,692 items in all. Skeptics believe that is not enough to genuinely make the world safe. Optimists say that the first step is the hardest, especially since the elimination of strategic offensive weapons lies ahead.

There is yet another argument in this long-standing dispute that I have heard repeatedly: It is bad enough, it is said, that the country has "squandered" huge amounts of money on the production of missiles, but now it is preparing to invest considerable sums in destroying them. And this is at a time when we are counting every kopeck. This is the topic with which I began a discussion with Lt Gen Vladimir Medvedev, the center's director.

[Medvedev] Of course, savings are essential, and we need to keep count of money spent. But the main thing is not just to count rubles or dollars spent or saved in this process. The political effect, the enhancement of mutual trust, and further steps along the path of disarmament cannot be measured in terms of money alone.

In principle, it is possible to calculate the technical side. What does the INF Treaty cost? The principal cost is several tens of millions of rubles for our inspection activities, plus tens of millions spent directly on eliminating the weapons. The Treaty on Strategic Offensive Arms [START Treaty] will require outlays an order of magnitude greater. But there is also income. Some of the hardware is not being totally eliminated but will continue to be used in our economy, such as SS-23 missile launchers. Profits can be obtained by extracting precious metals from the apparatus—silver, gold and platinum. These profits, of course, do not make up for the outlays

associated with destruction of the missiles. But sometimes another component of the overall economic calculations, which may be the most important one—the money saved from stopping missile production—is forgotten. Under this category the numbers involved are no longer just millions but billions of rubles.

[Shchedrin] How are your relations with colleagues from the United States developing?

[Medvedev] At one time—1988, to be exact—the nature of our relations was very restrained. It took time, mutual tactfulness and a high degree of professionalism before we learned to understand one another.

[Shchedrin] I have kept a statement by your American colleague, Gen Roland Lajoie, head of the U.S. On-Site Inspection Agency in which he gives an exceptionally high assessment of the training of Soviet personnel and the technical competence of our officers. Now that your center has expanded and totally new people have joined it, do you hope to maintain such a high level of training, and what, specifically, are the requirements of people who work for you?

[Medvedev] Now we have a new partner, Gen Robert Parker, with whom we have established constructive, businesslike relations. As for the requirements, the main one is that a person should be a specialist in the field of arms and absolutely must know the treaties and the rules and norms of relations with foreign citizens.

[Shchedrin] The START Treaty has been concluded. When will the first missile be destroyed?

[Medvedev] There is no fixed date. The time will start being counted from the day the treaty is ratified. Only a preliminary schedule has been drawn up for eliminating the delivery systems, and the places where this will occur have been designated. But I think that there is no need to rush events.

Of course, we will wait. We have waited decades, even when the production line was putting out missiles non-stop. We will wait another few months, and then another seven years. Over that period, in accordance with the treaty, the first part of the nuclear weapons will be destroyed. After seven years there will be 1,600 of them left. Skeptics will once again say that is too many. And optimists will say, the fewer the better.

START TALKS

Further on Kazakhstan SS-19 Missile Launch

924P0052A *Moscow IZVESTIYA* in Russian
23 Jan 92 Morning Edition p 2

[Article by Vladimir Nadein: "Alma-Ata Was Actually Not Informed of the Missile Launch, But the Main Reproaches Are Being Directed at the Press"]

[Text] "Kazakhstan, now a nuclear power, contends that it did not know anything about the test ICBM launch conducted by the still powerful central military command,

which is practically the only one remaining from the former communist superpower."

That is the way a REUTER correspondent commented on the recent article in IZVESTIYA concerning the fact that the military did not inform the Kazakhstan authorities of the SS-19 launch beforehand.

The press service of Kazakhstan's President N. Nazarbayev promptly disseminated a report which emphasized that the 20 December 1991 launch of the space vehicle rocket booster "Rokot" (this is the name of the modified SS-19 military missile) at the Baykonur space launch facility was undertaken "for scientific purposes in the conversion program" and that "reports on the testing of a ballistic missile for military purposes are not valid."

This is also fully corroborated by the reaction of official Washington. "The United States was notified of the testing of the space delivery of cargoes carried out to determine whether this missile is capable of serving commercial purposes," declared U.S. Department of Defense spokesman Oborn, as reported by REUTER. "They said that there are no warheads on the missile, and we have no reason not to believe this."

Oborn added that the notification came "from the central authorities in Moscow," and his colleague, U.S. Air Force Captain Susan Strednanski, stressed that this occurred 24 hours before the launch. "We are continuing to study this launch," said Captain Strednanski. "Based on national verification means we were able to ascertain that the test flight was not associated with previous SS-19 tests."

While the purely military aspect of the problem does not raise doubts, the problem of control over space launches remains urgent.

As indicated by agency reports, this problem is central to foreign partners as well. "Control of the nuclear arsenal of the former Soviet Union is a subject of main concern to Western countries, some of whom tied assistance to the countries of the new Commonwealth with adherence to international disarmament agreements," writes an ASSOCIATED PRESS columnist.

"Inasmuch as until now the member states of the Commonwealth have not yet worked out mutually acceptable approaches to the formation of armed forces, including the operation of the test range (especially since on 20 December a final decision on the formation of the CIS [Commonwealth of Independent States] did not yet exist), we think it is superfluous to dramatize each case of a test launch of space objects," N. Nazarbayev's press service report states.

Repeating the well-known position of the president of Kazakhstan on military questions and the use of space technology, the press service particularly emphasized the need to resolve all these problems "in phases, without haste, in order not to allow chaos and confusion in the process of reforming the army."

However, the reserved and far-sighted leader of Kazakhstan could not but admit that, "at the same time, Kazakhstan realizes that questions of control have really come to a head." Considering that the press service does not refute the main news that the launch was conducted without notifying the authorities of an independent country, such a conclusion, despite the outward appearance of a passing remark, is paramount.

However, it was not the position of the central military departments, to which the leadership of Kazakhstan reacted not only in a restrained way, but even with understanding, that was subjected to criticism. The sharpest words were addressed to the mass media: "The press service of the president of Kazakhstan considers the employment of any form of pressure on an independent state on this question to be intolerable, which is clearly overlooked in individual articles of the press both abroad and in the Commonwealth."

Rocket Forces in 'Constant Combat Readiness'

*PM2401142392 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 24 Jan 92 p 1*

[Report by Major A. Dolinin under general headline "Society in Alarm. Economy in Crisis. Army Maintaining Combat Capability. We Start Each Day Overcoming Difficulties"—first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] In a recent interview for SAARLAENDISCHER RUNDFUNK, FRG Bundestag Deputy Voigt stated that the strategic nuclear weapons situated on former USSR territory have been removed from combat readiness. According to available information, he added, the nuclear warheads have been removed from strategic missiles.

As we were told at the Strategic Rocket Forces Main Staff, the Rocket Forces are still in a state of constant combat readiness. As for dismantling the nuclear warheads, this can only relate to those rockets which have ended their operational life. The situation among troops is stable and the new training year has begun in an organized way, as our correspondent saw for himself when he visited some of the units. Although, of course, there are many difficulties in organizing the combat training of missilemen.

"This is the first time," Colonel General I. Sergeyev, deputy commander for combat training of the Strategic Rocket Forces, told me, "that we have met a situation in which the disruption of the draft and the discharge of servicemen who are also students—which is still taking its toll even now—have reduced the staffing of rocket units to 50 percent, and in some units the figure is even lower...."

Lieutenant Colonel S. Borovskiy confirmed: It is difficult now to maintain the stability of shifts on combat duty, to select details, and despite all this organize combat training. What solution has been found?

"There is only one way out of this situation," Lieutenant Colonel A. Khashegulgov said. "To reduce certain types of details and devise a deployment of manpower that would keep the withdrawal of sergeants and men from combat training to a minimum. Exercises will be repeated for those who miss them."

This approach is yielding results. An analysis of the first few days of training shows that, excluding valid absences, 95 percent of servicemen and all military units attended exercises.

Exercises followed the familiar pattern: emergency musters, route march preparations, and various types of tactical problems, but they were of great interest to students. I was persuaded of that by my conversations with Captain S. Kalashnikov, military affairs expert and chief of the best launch combat detail in the formation, Captain Yu. Nez-doliy, Senior Lieutenant M. Zhaparov, Warrant Officer I. Khudyashov, Sergeant S. Zinoveyenko....

Even the unfavorable weather conditions were no obstacle to the rocketmen. And here in the Kazakh steppes it must be said that conditions are exceptional. Just take the wind. This wind, known colloquially as "babay," persists for a week at a time once it starts blowing. And there is no escape from the wind here....

The field exercises, nevertheless, went well. Incidentally, the opinion of the main staff officers on this matter were confirmed by the computer. For the first time ever, the results of readiness for the new training year, as measured by 100 parameters, were fed into the computer. For example, the computer analyzed the timeliness and the quality of the transmission of tasks and initial data for the planning of combat trainings, the quality of training musters, officers' knowledge of directive documents, the readiness of the material-technical base, the training of new recruits, and material and technical backup for the training process.... For many parameters a positive dynamic was recorded in comparison with the previous training year.

Kazakh President, French Foreign Minister Discuss START

Discuss Missile Withdrawal

OW2501170692 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1356 GMT 25 Jan 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Excerpts] France and Kazakhstan are satisfied with talks they held in Alma-Ata, President Nursultan Nazarbayev and French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas said at a news conference on Saturday [25 January]. [passage omitted].

Arms control was one of the key subjects of the French-Kazakh talks. President Nazarbayev reassured the French guest that in accordance with a quadripartite agreement signed in Alma-Ata on December 21, 1991, all strategic weapons remained under unified command and control. "All talk about nuclear weapons and nuclear

technologies being handed over by Kazakhstan to Arab countries is groundless. It is just someone's desire to diminish Kazakhstan's role" he explained "There are certain forces that want to distort Kazakhstan's clear stand on the subject matter".

He revealed that medium-range missiles were "being pulled out to Russia, and this process will be completed by 1994 with respect to strategic missiles, Kazakhstan is willing to join the START treaty, and the Kazakh parliament is to ratify it.

Asked about reports that a SS-19 missile was launched from the territory of Kazakhstan, Mr. Nazarbayev expressed his bewilderment as to why "this incident which occurred a month ago should be taken up now".

Kazakhstan To Ratify Treaty

PM2901133792 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 29 Jan 92 p 3

[Correspondent Colonel A. Ladin report: "Talks Went Successfully"]

[Text] Bilateral talks between delegations from Kazakhstan and France were held in Alma-Ata 25 January, with Kazakhstan Republic President Nursultan Nazarbayev and French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas taking part.

At a news conference on the results of the talks, N. Nazarbayev and R. Dumas expressed their mutual satisfaction with the results of the meeting, at which they discussed issues relating to the activity of the Commonwealth of Independent States. As the Kazakh president said, he had briefed his top-level guest extensively on the republic's position on military questions.

Roland Dumas stressed that now, following the successful talks, France would take all necessary steps to open a diplomatic mission in Alma-Ata with all haste, and an appropriate document about this has been signed.

Answering questions about the future of the nuclear weapons located on Kazakh territory, President Nazarbayev said that they are being taken away to Russia because this is the only place that has a plant capable of destroying these weapons. As far as strategic missiles are concerned, we are prepared to sign the relevant international START Treaty, which we will ratify in our parliament, N. Nazarbayev stated. At the moment it is hard to say how long this will take, he added.

SDI, DEFENSE & SPACE ARMS

Pentagon Said To Push for End to ABM Treaty

PM2801170792 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
28 Jan 92 p 4

[Report by correspondent Vladislav Drobkov: "Farewell to ABM Treaty? Pentagon Advocates Repeal of Soviet-U.S. Treaty Restricting ABM Systems. Administration Ready To Concede"]

[Text] Washington—There are fears that the ABM Treaty concluded by the United States and the USSR in 1972 may not see its 20th anniversary. THE WASHINGTON POST reported Sunday, 26 January, that the administration intends either to review the provisions of the agreement—which has restrained any race in ABM weapons between the two superpowers for two decades—or to abandon it altogether. Any obstacles to or limitations on the development [razrabotka] and deployment of "star wars" weaponry would thereby be scrapped.

The collapse of the USSR may be a formal excuse to abandon the ABM Treaty. However, the real idea behind this step is to give the Pentagon a free hand to expedite its SDI initiative. As soon as President Reagan proclaimed his intention in 1983 to implement SDI—better known as the "star wars" program—the U.S. military department made no secret of its desire to abandon the ABM Treaty, or at least erode some of its provisions. But the treaty had too many supporters in Congress. After all, it is no secret that for many years the ABM Treaty was the foundation of strategic stability.

Incidentally, U.S. researchers and the military industry have recently had considerable success in developing [sozdaniye] SDI systems. And last year Congress passed a resolution on deploying an ABM network—admittedly limited for the time being—by 1996. In its budget for the current fiscal year the Pentagon has been allocated record appropriations of around \$4.15 billion for the "star wars" program. This is over a billion more than last year. The Pentagon is counting on getting more than \$5 billion for SDI in fiscal 1993.

Naturally, given such a scale, the framework of the ABM Treaty is getting increasingly cramped and irritating. And it is not important that the potential adversary against whom it was initially planned to develop [sozdavat] a shield impenetrable by missiles from space no longer threatens the United States. As its basic argument in favor of expediting SDI the military department cites fears that in the future missile technologies, along with the ability to produce nuclear, chemical, and bacteriological warheads, may proliferate around the world. As Pentagon chief Richard Cheney recently announced, ballistic missiles may be in service with a couple of dozen states by the year 2000. "We need the ability to protect the country, our forces, and our overseas allies from ballistic missile attack," he stated.

So the expediting of the "star wars" program is settled. In the very near future, General C. Powell, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has stated, "you will see that the President will resolutely defend the continued development [razrabotka] of strategic defense."

Pentagon Cuts Said Not To Include SDI

PM2901161192 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
28 Jan 92 Morning Edition p 7

[Report by Artur Blinov: "The Pentagon's New Accents. The United States Is Saving Billions, But Not at the Expense of SDI"]

[Text] The paradox of U.S. military programs is that steps to cut the strategic arsenal and reduce purchases of several types of armaments will be announced in the very near future, but the "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) will not be affected by this.

As has been reported, the U.S. media predicted that President G. Bush, in his next State of the Union message, will advocate the elimination of a sizeable part of the strategic forces of the United States and the Commonwealth of Independent States [CIS]—ground-based ICBM's with multiple warheads. As a gesture, compensating in some degree for the disruption of the nuclear balance (the CIS has more of these missiles than the United States), a willingness will be expressed to reduce some of the warheads on U.S. submarine-launched ballistic missiles.

The reductions will also affect other military programs. For instance, according to press data, U.S. Secretary of Energy James Watkins is preparing to halt production of the brand-new W-88 warhead for submarine-launched ballistic missiles. So the plant in Rocky Flats will suspend operations indefinitely.

The administration leadership says that the new initiatives are the direct result of the change in the overall strategic situation since the end of the cold war. For example, new CIA Director R. Gates addressed Congress last week and said that "for another decade at least... there is no need to fear other countries' special armaments posing a danger to U.S. territory."

There is a real chance to effect military expenditure savings, which is something the United States needs too, since it faces the problem of an acute budget deficit. There is information to suggest that the G. Bush administration is planning to cut the Pentagon budget by \$3-4 billion in the next fiscal year.

In preparation for these cuts, the U.S. military department is voicing the intention to accept some new armaments only in the form of prototypes or designs, without starting series production of them. What there will be in fact is a kind of order book containing various models of equipment—it will be used only in the event of a military threat and in accordance with the specific situation.

The systematic development of new models of equipment without putting them into series production will enable the U.S. Armed Forces to always be in the vanguard of military-technical achievements, without overstretching its budget. It is proposed to reduce the scale of several military programs that are already being implemented, including purchases of the B-2 strategic bomber—the most expensive combat aircraft.

At the same time, there is a military program which, to all appearances, will not be affected by the budget cuts. That is, the plans for the creation of ABM defense under the SDI program. Expenditure on the SDI program in the current fiscal year was increased by \$1 billion compared with the previous year. According to a report in THE WASHINGTON POST, another \$1 billion will be

added to the SDI budget in the new, 1993 fiscal year, bringing the total to \$5 billion.

According to a plan approved last year by Congress, a limited ABM defense system for part of the territory of the United States will be deployed by 1996.

Eminent U.S. specialists note that the deployment of ABM defenses even in this limited form will obviously require a revision of the ABM Treaty signed in 1972 between the USSR and the United States. There are signs that the U.S. side is already making preparations for such a step.

The list of agreements was in the hands of members of the U.S. delegation, headed by U.S. Under Secretary of State R. Bartholomew, which went recently to Moscow and the capitals of the other nuclear republics of the CIS. The U.S. delegation's aim, THE WASHINGTON POST reports, was to obtain direct confirmation from the republics' leaders that they would observe the agreements in the arms control sphere that were concluded with the participation of the Soviet Union. They were referring primarily to the Treaty on the Reduction of Strategic Offensive Armaments and the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe.

The U.S. delegation did not broach the question of the fate of the ABM Treaty at these talks, the U.S. newspaper claims. An unidentified U.S. Administration spokesman explained to the newspaper's correspondent that this "omission" was due to the fact that the United States "does not intend to revise the Treaty on the Reduction of Strategic Offensive Armaments, but intends to hold talks on amending the ABM Treaty."

Not all the U.S. experts on military-strategic matters support the plans for a revision of the ABM Treaty and deployment of ABM systems. According to Matthew Bann [name as transliterated], an eminent U.S. expert in the arms control sphere, the implementation of the "strategic defense initiative" could lead to a "stupid waste of countless billions in the interests of creating a debatable defense against a nonexistent threat."

CONVENTIONAL FORCES IN EUROPE

Russian Defense Aide Urges 2-Million Man Troop Cut

PM3001155692 Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian
24 Jan 92 p 6

[Olav Trygge Storvik report: "Fresh Visit From Moscow"]

[Text] "The politicians are talking about reducing our military forces by 700,000 men, but in my view they should be reduced by 2 million," Major General Aleksandr Tsalko, Russia's second deputy defense minister, said at a press conference at the Defense Minister in Oslo 23 January. Together with First Deputy Defense Minister Vitaliy Shlykov he held talks 23 January with

Defense Minister Johan Jorgen Holst and also met with representatives of the Foreign Ministry and the Storting.

Major General Tsalko is not just anybody. He occupies a high-ranking post in the airborne division, and in the eighties he was the head of a helicopter division in Afghanistan. During the coup in Moscow in August last year, he organized and led the defense of the Moscow's White House, the Russian national assembly. Since then he has made a rapid political career and is now responsible for questions to do with the withdrawal of forces from Eastern Europe and their relocation in other regions. One of First Deputy Defense Minister Shlykov's responsibilities under the former regime in the Soviet Union was industrial intelligence in the West. Now he works on control of nuclear arms, the questions of "closed cities," and the defense budget.

Their talks 23 January with Defense Minister Holst were about control over Soviet nuclear weapons in a difficult transitional period and the problems of preventing the spread of technical and scientific expertise and knowledge. The withdrawal of Soviet forces and their redeployment in Russia were also discussed.

Major General Tsalko spoke openly and directly about these problems at the press conference 23 January. "We cannot keep the military forces in Russia at the same high level as today, nor do we want to," he said. "But the problem is: What is to happen to the men who become superfluous?"

He said the Russian really does not have a choice. Redeploying the soldiers in new locations solves no problems. "The politicians say that we must reduce by 700,000, but in my view we ought to reduce by 2 million." He has no recipe for what to do with the large number of men who will be excess to needs. "But I think that it is safer that these forces remain under military control for the time being than that they are sent into a life of unemployment and homelessness," he said.

However, he avoided the question of how many troops will be transferred to the Kola Peninsula as forces are redeployed. "We will deploy our forces where needed once the threat has been analyzed thoroughly, but today we are unable to see any growing threat from Norway," he joked, adding that the climate in the north is too cold for forces accustomed to warmer climes.

On this point Defense Minister Johan Jorgen Holst was quick to add that there is nothing to indicate that the Russians are increasing their military presence in the Kola region. "Some air force divisions have arrived there, but no troops. What is important for us is that the Russians respect the agreement on conventional disarmament in Europe and honor the commitment that no regions will be exposed to a greater threat than others. We are relying on the Russians when they say that they will adhere to the provisions contained in existing agreements," Holst said.

WGF Chief, Mecklenburg Premier Cited on Withdrawal

*PM2701120192 Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 24 Jan 92 p 3*

[Report by Colonel V. Markushin: "Alfred Gomolka Promises to Aid the Western Group of Forces (WGF)"]

[Text] How to step up the sale of the Western Group of Forces' [WGF] property, cooperate more efficiently in eliminating ecological damage, and organize the retraining of our servicemen from the resources allocated—these and certain other questions were the object of a lively discussion at a meeting between A. Gomolka, prime minister of Mecklenburg-West Pomerania Land, and Colonel General M. Burlakov, commander of the Western Group of Forces. The meeting took place in Neustrelitz, the city through which the main flow of shipments carried by sea from the Western Group of Forces passes.

Col. Gen. M. Burlakov cited graphic figures: We are leaving behind 1,280 housing blocks containing 18,000 apartments, together with many hundreds of other facilities—barracks, schools, stores, and clubs—all built using our funds. In other words, just what is most badly needed by the troops being withdrawn. Last year more than 15,000 servicemen and their families left Germany, having no apartments to go to.

At the same time, the pace of the construction of housing for them in no way corresponds to the pace of the withdrawal of troops, the commander stressed. Moreover, even the housing which will eventually be built will not be enough for everyone. Additional funds are needed. They might have been generated by the sale of camps left behind by the servicemen, their total value being set at 2 billion Marks. But so far not a pfennig has been received.

One of the reasons for this situation, M. Burlakov said, is the artificial restraints placed on the sale by the FRG Ministry of Finances. This department is not facilitating the regular dissemination of information about already finished facilities, and is not permitting interested persons and organizations to acquire them—expecting that it will be possible to pick up all this for a song at a later date.

I would like to secure the appropriate support of the Land government in solving this vitally important question, the commander said. A. Gomolka, who is at the same time chairman of the Bundesrat, assured those present that he will provide such support.

Division of Armed Forces, Paris Treaty Viewed

LD2701102992

[Editorial Report] Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian at 1200 GMT on 25 January broadcasts in its "The Armed Forces and Society" program a three-minute recorded interview with Reserve Captain First Rank Oleg Mikhaylovich Lisov, a military expert and a senior scientific staff member of the Russian-American

University, by Igor Makarov, about the implications of the division of the USSR's armed forces for the terms of the Paris Treaty on the reduction of conventional armaments in Europe by the NATO member states and the Warsaw Pact member countries.

Lisov reiterates the main terms of the treaty, noting that such weapons as tanks, armored carriers, artillery, combat aircraft, strike helicopters, and mechanized bridges are to be reduced to certain levels by 1994.

Makarov then asks Lisov to be specific about the distribution of such weapons among the member states of the Commonwealth of Independent States:

"[Makarov] For instance, how many will Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, or Ukraine be allowed to have?"

"[Lisov] It is for the governments of the states you named to reply to this question.

"[Makarov] But will the weapons and equipment of the new units, such as the so called national guards, be included in these parameters?"

"[Lisov] Without fail. The above-mentioned levels may not be exceeded under any pretext whatsoever by introducing any units. The figures stipulated in the treaties must be strictly complied with.

"[Makarov] In your view, what will make it possible to solve this very difficult problem which has arisen?"

"[Lisov] In my view, all sovereign states of the former Soviet Union need to start talks on the allocation of their commitments under the treaty which was signed and to start destroying immediately very large quantities of military equipment and armaments. The leaders of the recently formed sovereign states need to confirm now their obligations under the above-mentioned treaty."

Baltic Assembly Deals With Issue of Soviet Withdrawal

Russian Official Comments

*LD2501175892 Moscow TASS International
Service in Russian 1430 GMT 25 Jan 92*

[By TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina]

[Text] Riga, 25 Jan (TASS)—Within the framework of the work taking place here at the first session of the interparliamentary Baltic Assembly, a meeting with the command of the Armed Forces of the former Soviet Union situated on Baltic territory took place today. The meeting's participants laid out their positions and indicated the problems connected with the withdrawal of the Army from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

At the request of a TASS correspondent, Vladimir Lopatin, deputy chairman of the Russian state committee on defense issues, commented on the exchange of opinions that took place. He noted that the sides talked about troops under Russian jurisdiction. The Russian president made a statement on this on 17 January. Yesterday the Russian parliament confirmed the financing of the

troops situated outside the Commonwealth of Independent States. The publication of a presidential decree to this effect is expected soon. Russia has jurisdiction over military property, both mobile and fixed. The unilateral decision by the Baltic states on the nationalization of parts of army property may, in the view of Lopatin, worsen the situation. These issues should be discussed at the interstate level. In regard to reports in the foreign press that the naval base in Latvia is selling submarines to third countries, Lopatin says that not a single military unit or base has the right to sell these.

No one is arguing with the necessity of withdrawing Army units from the Baltics, Vladimir Lopatin continued. The timeframe and schedule, bearing in mind the sad experience of the withdrawal of troops from Eastern Europe, will depend on the preparations for the social basis and certain guarantees for servicemen and their families. The creation of such guarantees requires the efforts of Russia and of other states interested in the withdrawal of the Army.

In conclusion, Vladimir Lopatin stressed that the decisions of the Baltic Assembly on this issue will be recommendations and will be useful at the official talks between the Russian delegation and delegations of the three Baltic countries. Such talks will begin next week.

News Conference Held

LD2501204792 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1835 GMT 25 Jan 92

[By TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina]

[Text] Riga, 25 Jan (TASS)—The points of view of the representative of Russia and the representatives of the delegations of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia differ on a number of points. This was revealed at a news conference held after the meeting of Baltic Assembly participants with the command of the Armed Forces of the former Union in regard to troops stationed in the Baltic republics. The Baltic states are united that a political solution on the troop withdrawal must not be dependent on social conditions. In their opinion, the intention to demobilize 367 units on Baltic territory, affecting the demographic situation, is debatable. The view of the three republics is that the Army subunits must first be withdrawn and then demobilized.

The republics envision their participation in the European system of collective security in the absence of foreign troops on their territory.

The Russian representative admitted the possibility of keeping a proportion of troops strategically designated to ensure pan-European security.

Interview With Latvian Official

LD2601042392 Riga Radio Riga Network in Latvian 1600 GMT 25 Jan 92

[Text] A news conference has just ended at the Supreme Council. (Indre) Toome, Romualds Ozols, Mihails Stepicevs, and Russian representative Vladimir Lopatin,

participants in the Baltic Assembly, met with journalists. The subject of the discussion was the status of the former Soviet Army in the Baltics. After the news conference correspondent Baiba Saberte and Mihails Stepicevs, secretary of the Commission for Defense and Internal Affairs of the Supreme Council of Latvia, had a talk.

[Begin recording] [Saberte] The problem of the Army. The problem of the former Soviet Army, because a new master has risen for this former Soviet Army—Russia.

[Stepicevs] It must be said that the position of Mr. Lopatin was clear. This is the present position of the Russians, who would, after all, like to preserve their influence, let us say, the military influence, the political influence, in this region. This can be seen clearly, and nobody concealed this from them.

At the same time the main point is that Russia would like to first discuss resolving social problems and then the withdrawal of the Army. Our categorical position is as follows: the withdrawal of the Army, and resolving the social problems in the course of the withdrawal. And resolving the problems not at our expense; they could be resolved, of course, at the expense of Russia, with the help of the Western countries, probably, ready to assist with their means.

We might be able to actively collaborate with these countries should our initiative be necessary there. But we are not able to invest materially in any way; we simply have nothing to invest, and we do not owe anything to anybody. These questions were unequivocally explained to Lopatin. He understands partially, but this stance—regarding the resolution of the economic and social problems first—he would like to maintain these positions, but it appears to me that there is no realistic basis there. This social aspect has been taken out of our adopted appeal to the president and parliament of Russia. We are not taking on any commitments in this, and we do not connect this problem of withdrawal with the social problem.

[Saberte] Mr. Lopatin—not without reason—did not want to even mention the term occupation army, because that would immediately involve another status, different responsibilities and obligations.

[Stepicevs] I think this word occupation would not be the main thing today. If we started with this problem, it would be prolonged by determining the status of occupation. Then we would have to draw up an entirely different withdrawal plan. If possible, I think that if we are able to withdraw by a shorter way, let us proceed along this shorter way with whatever status we would now assign to these troops. It is important that they be ready to leave. We must now proceed to that; we must not lose a single day because the situation in Russia is so unstable that we do not know what will happen tomorrow, never mind a month later.

If Russia is ready to start these talks, as early as this week, commissions can be set up to work on these problems. The talks will be very difficult—I already feel

this now—because Russia has worked out a certain stance. Well, our position quite surely will not be in harmony with that position. But there should not be any kind of hesitation, starting discussions about some kind of status, about what has happened and what has not; the whole world knows what has happened, we know what has happened, they know as well, so let us not waste time on what we might lose. We must not lose another day; we must begin to act. And our goal, understand, for Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia there is but one goal: withdrawal.

The question: What to take and what to leave here. This question is a separate question for each state. Lithuania is ready to give back everything to the army of Russia, and to remain as it stands, it is the stance of [words indistinct]. Our stance is to keep the immovable property; this is our property. Estonia went further than that—not giving away anything at all, even not to allow [word indistinct] to be taken away. This is an internal matter for each state, and it will be dealt with in talks.

[Sabarte] Yes, but during these talks won't the withdrawal of the Army be dragged out to eternity? Russia says that the primary matter is the creation of social guarantees. Until the economy—in its present situation—is able to create social guarantees (?in Russia) for all these troops, it is simply not realistic to talk about, let us say, the shortest time, as was stated today by Romualdas Ozolas [words indistinct].

[Stepicevs] You understand that this is the position of Russia, their position today. It may change tomorrow. It may change only if we express our categorical stance and prove our position. This is why talks are required. There must be talks; there must be discussions about which state tries to take more with it and leave less behind. Our job is to not give up what belongs to us.

The talks will be led by Mr. Dinevics from the Supreme Council. There will be (?a couple of) deputies and a group of experts from the government. Latvia's position is unequivocal. It is clear in our minds. [end recording]

You have just heard a conversation with Mihails Stepicevs, secretary of the Commission for Defense and Internal Affairs and a participant in the Baltic Assembly.

Meet With Army Group

LD2601160892 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in English
2230 GMT 25 Jan 92

[Text] The first session of the Baltic countries' interparliamentary assembly continued its work in Riga for the second day.

Today the Lithuanian, Latvian, and, Estonian MPs [members of parliament] held a meeting behind closed doors with the leadership of Russia's North Western Army Grouping, which has its headquarters in Riga. Both the chief of the Army Grouping, General Valeriy Mironov, and the MPs who took part in the meeting are reported to have assessed it positively. MP Romualdas Ozolas pointed out that they had received answers to three main questions: Russia stated clearly that it was in

charge of the troops as the successor of the former Soviet Union. It agreed unconditionally to the wording that the troops were to be pulled out and talks were to be held shortly. If after then no unexpected events which could interfere with the start of the talks occur I think they will set off well, said Romualdas Ozolas.

The participants in the session of the Baltic Assembly today also had a meeting with a delegation of the Nordic Council.

Appeal to Yeltsin

LD2601174992 Moscow TASS in English
1644 GMT 26 Jan 92

[By TASS correspondents Galina Kuchina and Valeriy Zaytsev]

[Text] Riga January 26 TASS—The first plenary session of the Baltic Assembly ended its work today in Riga. The assembly is an inter-parliamentarian body of the independent Baltic states.

Participants made an appeal to Russian President Boris Yeltsin and the parliament of the Russian Federation to move out the troops, which are under command of the Russian government, deployed in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. According to the document, the Baltic assembly hopes that during the negotiations, scheduled for January 28-29, the sides will determine shortened terms and schedule for the complete withdrawal of the Russian troops from the Baltic territory, and that the withdrawal will begin immediately.

In the final document the assembly recommended Baltic parliaments and governments to discuss a draft interstate agreement to create a legal basis for cooperation and development of the national economy, and work out basic principles for the creation of the Baltic market, integrating step by step into the European economic structures.

The assembly approved recommendations for restoring the legal bureau of the Baltic states and other documents.

The next Baltic Assembly meeting is scheduled for July, to be held in Lithuania.

Russia's Shakhray To Negotiate Pullout From Estonia, Lithuania

To Arrive in Tallinn 2 Feb

OW3001013892 Moscow BALTFAX in English
1855 GMT 29 Jan 92

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The official representative of Russia in Estonia Oleg Popovich told BF [BALTFAX] that a Russian state delegation led by Vice-Premier Sergey Shakhray arrives in Tallinn February 2 for talks on the fate of Russian forces stationed in Estonia.

The delegation is authorized to negotiate the presence or withdrawal of troops from the Baltics.

Postpones Vilnius Visit

*LD2901121492 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network
in Lithuanian 1000 GMT 29 Jan 92*

[Text] Sergey Shakh-ray and the Russian delegation he will lead in negotiating the withdrawal of former Soviet troops from the Baltic states will not arrive in Vilnius tomorrow. The Russian representatives were to visit Estonia before arriving in Vilnius. A report from Moscow says that these meetings have been postponed. It looks as if the tactics of promises and procrastination used in solving this pressing issue do not change in Moscow.

Shakray Arrives in Vilnius

*LD3101111692 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network
in Lithuanian 0800 GMT 31 Jan 92*

[Text] A delegation from the Russian Federation for negotiations with the Baltic states arrived today in Vilnius. The delegation is led by Sergey Shakh-ray, Russian vice prime minister and state adviser on legal policy. The delegation is to discuss political and military issues, including the withdrawal of the Soviet Army from the territory of the Republic of Lithuania.

In addition to Sergey Shakh-ray, the delegation includes Yuriy Zaytsev, chairman of the citizenship commission attached to the Russian president; Aleksandr Kotenkov, deputy chairman of the defense and protection committee of the Russian Supreme Soviet; Minister Vladimir Mashits, chairman of the state committee for economic cooperation with the members of the Commonwealth of Independent States; Fedor Shelov-Kovedyayev, first deputy minister of foreign affairs of the Russian Federation; and Yevgeniy Kozhokin, deputy chairman of the commission on international affairs and external economic relations of the Russian Supreme Soviet. Another 27 experts and advisers also arrived.

The Republic of Lithuania will be represented by Supreme Council Deputy Chairman Ceslovas Stankevicius; Minister of National Defense Audrius Butkevicius; Minister Without Portfolio Aleksandras Abisala; Deputy Foreign Minister Gediminas Serksnys; Saulius Peceliunas, chairman of the commission on national defense and internal affairs of the Lithuanian Supreme Council; Supreme Council Presidium member Mecys Laurinkus; and Supreme Council Deputy Egidijus Jarasiunas.

The meeting will start at 1100 at Draugyste Hotel.

Strength of Armed Forces To Drop to 2.5 Million

Gen Koltunov Details Cuts

*OW3001170992 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1545 GMT 30 Jan 92*

[By diplomatic correspondents M. Mayorov and I. Porshnev; from the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Maj.-Gen. Viktor Koltunov, spokesman for the General Staff, has said the strength of the Commonwealth Armed Forces will total 2.5 million men once the personnel cuts suggested by President Yeltsin have been made.

Addressing newsmen in the Russian Foreign Ministry on Wednesday [29 January], the general explained that the 700,000 reduction announced by Moscow on December 5 was to be made from the overall number of Armed Forces staff, while under the Yeltsin plan the same strength would be deduced from the number of people in active military service.

General Koltunov said Russia intended to reduce the number of large-scale military exercises. He reminded newsmen the Soviet Union and the United States had agreed on certain confidence-building measures with respect to exercises involving up to 60 heavy strategic bombers. Under the Yeltsin plan, the number of such bombers will be reduced to 30.

The Soviet-US Treaty on Strategic Offensive Weapons is still awaiting ratification by the Russian parliament, but Russia has already begun to reduce the nuclear stocks on its territory. According to Gen. Koltunov, some 600 sea- and land-based strategic missiles have already been withdrawn from operational service, and some 130 ballistic silo launchers have been or are about to be destroyed. Gen. Koltunov said a whole range of other systems were not to be upgraded. And, he added, the dismantling of nuclear weapons on Ukrainian territory had already begun.

Ambassador Aleksey Obukhov, who represented the Russian Foreign Ministry at the news conference, said the US and Russian presidents had come out with their new initiatives at a time when fear was being removed from relations between the two countries. Russia and the United States had a chance to become allies, Ambassador Obukhov said, and Moscow would not want its missiles to cover targets in the United States or US missiles to cover targets in this country. He felt disarmament was a stage-by-stage process that was to be carried out on a parity basis.

30 Percent Cut by 1 July

*LD2901222992 Moscow Teleradiokompaniya
Ostankino Television First Program Network
in Russian 2115 GMT 29 Jan 92*

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] An INTERFAX correspondent has learned from well-informed sources at the General Staff of the Commonwealth of Independent States Armed Forces that, by 1 July, the central apparatus of the Armed Forces is to be reduced by 30 percent. Around 160-170,000 of the already announced 700,000 reduction in the Armed Forces is accounted for by members of the officer corps. The officers are to be discharged by 1 January 1993.

SHORT-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

Reports on Shift of Nuclear Arms From Belarus to Russia

Strategic Arms To Leave by 1995

LD2401173492 Moscow POSTFACTUM in English
1526 GMT 24 Jan 92

[From the "Military News" section: "In Early February All Tactical Nuclear Weapons Will Be Withdrawn From the Territory of Ukraine and Belarus"—POSTFACTUM headline]

[Text] According to confidential sources, in early February all tactical nuclear weapons will be withdrawn from the territory of Ukraine and Belarus. Strategic weapons (mobile intercontinental ballistic missiles) are expected to leave Belarus by 1995.

First Batch of Tactical Arms Moved

LD2601113292 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1049 GMT 26 Jan 92

[Report by BELTA correspondents Vladimir Glod and Aleksandr Kryzhanovskiy]

[Text] Minsk, 26 Jan (TASS)—The first batch of tactical nuclear weapons have already been transported from Belarus to the territory of the Russian Federation, where in accordance with an accord they will be destroyed.

This was stated today by Leonid Privalov, deputy chairman of the commission for matters of national security of the Belorussian parliament. Speaking at a "round table" for journalists covering the visit of French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas, he confirmed the republic's commitment to becoming a non-nuclear, neutral state in the near future. "Belarus will be free of strategic nuclear weapons in approximately 1996 or 1997," Leonid Privalov said. After this, only the armed forces of the republic of Belarus will remain on its territory. The deputy chairman of the parliamentary commission did not give their projected number. "Today, Belarus cannot see an enemy who it is necessary to go to war against, either on its borders or further afield," he stressed.

Parliamentarian Comments

924P0056B Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 28 Jan 92 p 3

[Report from KRASNAYA ZVEZDA and TASS correspondents: "First Lot of Nuclear Weapons Taken Out of Belarus and Sent to Russia"]

[Text] Minsk, 27 Jan—The first lot of tactical nuclear weapons has already been taken out of Belarus and sent to territory of the Russian Federation where it will be destroyed in accordance with an understanding, reported Leonid Privalov, deputy chairman of the

Belorussian parliament's Commission on National Security. Appearing at a "roundtable" for journalists covering a visit by French Minister of Foreign Affairs Roland Dumas, he confirmed the republic's adherence to becoming a nonnuclear, neutral state in the near future.

Leonid Privalov stated that "Belarus will become free of strategic weapons around 1996 or 1997." After that time, only the Armed Forces of the Belarus Republic will remain in its territory. The deputy chairman of the parliamentary commission did not provide figures as to their contemplated strength, but noted that in Denmark, for example, the army is comprised of 27,000 individuals—this with a population of 5 million. "Belarus has 10 million residents—one need only solve the equation," Privalov stated. And he added: "Belarus does not see any enemy today we might have to fight—neither at its borders nor anywhere beyond."

CHEMICAL & BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

Russian Chemical Weapons Elimination Group Formed

LD2801124792 Moscow POSTFACTUM in English
2359 GMT 27 Jan 92

[From the "Military News" section]

[Text] According to some sources, a state committee for elimination of chemical weapons will be created in Russia in early February. According to the sources close to the Russian Foreign Ministry, it will include specialists from the former departments, which were in charge of their development and production. Russia will do the main part of work in the elimination of chemical weapons. However, Ukraine, Belarus, Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan agreed to make some financial contribution for the solution of this problem.

REPUBLIC NUCLEAR WEAPONS ISSUES

Ukrainian Nationalists Want To Keep Nuclear Weapons

PM3001163192 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
30 Jan 92 Morning Edition p 1

[KHARKOV NOVOSTI report: "Nationalists Favor Nuclear Arms"]

[Text] Kiev—The Ukrainian National Assembly [Ukrainskaya natsionalnava asambleya]—a small but active political grouping—has come out in favor of keeping tactical nuclear weapons.

According to the Ukrainian National Assembly, it will enable the Ukraine to save on conventional armaments. Assembly representatives went to the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet building bearing the slogan "Let Moscow Be the First To Disarm!"

FRANCE

Aerospatiale, Thomson-CSF Discuss Joint ABM System Development*92WS0110X Paris LES ECHOS in French 25 Oct 91 p 10*

[Article by Alexandra Schwartzbrod: "Aerospatiale and Thomson-CSF May Step Up Their Collaboration"; first paragraph is LES ECHOS introduction]

[Text] The two groups are already partners on surface-to-air missiles and plan to join forces on anti-ballistic missile [ABM] systems. At road's end is a market worth several tens of billions of French francs [Fr].

After deciding to carry out an ambitious program of collaboration on surface-to-air missiles, Aerospatiale and Thomson-CSF may soon find themselves at the center of a vast European, or even Euro-American, cooperative effort on ABM systems. The CoSyDe consortium formed by the two manufacturers in 1986 to reflect on future threats and ways of countering them—and which had so far limited itself to doing some studies for the SDIO (Strategic Defense Initiative Organization) in the United States—may be seriously activated.

The consortium, which maintains a very low profile, employs no personnel, and generates sales of less than 30 million French francs [FR] a year, has gained special importance since the Gulf War and the upheavals in Eastern Europe. For although "Star Wars" as imagined by Ronald Reagan has sputtered out, defense against ballistic missiles has become one of the big priorities of certain governments endangered by proliferation in the South or uncontrolled launches from the East.

Hence the reason for the interest of Pierre Joxe, smitten by high technology and space systems, in research that may even enable France and the United States to collaborate (according to a report recently submitted to the Defense Ministry by the DGA, General Weapons Delegation). The Americans have decided to shift the focus of the SDI program to protection against limited strikes of ballistic missiles (GPALS) and have lately been putting the squeeze on Europe to join in, both for financial and political reasons.

In such a context, France is a choice target. It is developing an anti-aircraft defense system with ABM capabilities within the Eurosam consortium, which includes Aerospatiale and Thomson-CSF as well as the Italian firm Alenia. The Pentagon, whose systems (Arrow and Erint) are much less advanced, is keenly interested in it. According to the American review "Defense News", the French government may soon grant two contracts with that fact in mind.

The first, worth just over Fr200 million, has reportedly gone to CoSyDe to study the technical feasibility of an ABM system capable of zone defense. The consortium recently demonstrated that it could be developed and deployed in less than 10 years for a cost of between Fr30 and 50 billion. The second contract, for nearly Fr700 million, should be awarded to the Eurosam consortium to study the adaptation of its SAMP (medium-range surface-to-air) system to ABM missile weaponry.

The German government is very sensitive to the risks of uncontrolled launches, and may join the undertaking with MBB and Siemens as subcontractors. A formal agreement is expected to be signed in the coming weeks as a result of negotiations now underway among the French, German, and Italian Defense Ministries on the question.

GERMANY

Kohl Remarks on Bush, Yeltsin Initiatives*LD2901165292 Berlin ADN in German 1521 GMT 29 Jan 92*

[Excerpt] Bonn (ADN)—According to Chancellor Kohl, the immediate response by Russian President Boris Yeltsin to the wide-ranging disarmament initiative by U.S. President George Bush shows that both sides are fulfilling their responsibility for the security of the whole world.

Yeltsin's swift reaction is an encouraging signal, says a statement from Kohl issued in Bonn on Wednesday [29 January]. Now there is a prospect that "our concerns regarding the former Soviet nuclear potential are being taken into account." With the reduction of nuclear potential, peace is being made more secure so that energy can now be concentrated on urgent development of the economy. What matters now, the Chancellor's statement concludes, is that talks about details begin very soon. [passage omitted]

Bundeswehr Strength To Be 'Considerably' Reduced*AU2901151892 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU in German 29 Jan 92 p 4*

["rei" report: "Soldiers Should Learn More"]

[Text] Bonn, 28 January—The strength of the Bundeswehr is to be considerably reduced in the future. At the same time, soldiers should receive a more qualified training and be offered better promotion prospects. As the Defense Ministry announced on Tuesday [28 January], a reduction from over 490,000 to 370,000 soldiers by 1995 is planned. Basic military service will remain 12 months. The Army administration, where about 44,000 jobs will be eliminated, will again be examined in 1995 for a further reduction. The Bundestag groups of the Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union and of the Free Democratic Party of Germany still have to approve this concept.

The heaviest cut will affect draftees; their number will be reduced by 26 percent from 212,000 to 155,000. The number of privates who sign up for a fixed term will be reduced from 45,777 to 38,000. Reservists will be reduced by 1,000 to 4,000. The number of noncommissioned officers will drop from 177,911 to 133,300, the number of officers from 51,303 to 39,700. The number of generals will be reduced from 237 to 209.

The number of majors is to be cut by nearly 50 percent whereas the number of lieutenant colonels will remain nearly constant, meaning improved promotion prospects for some officers. For those who could only become majors in the past, it will now also be possible to become lieutenant generals.

The labor market, which has grown as a result of German Unification, and uncertainties concerning the future of the Bundeswehr are currently causing a considerable shortage of recruits; thus, about 7,000 noncommissioned officer positions were not filled last year. To increase the attractiveness of the Bundeswehr, but also to be able to fulfill the demands concerning modern technology, there are plans to intensify the training. The number of soldiers in training groups will be reduced from 12 to nine. At the same time, a greater number of trainers and more qualified trainers will be available.

Bush's State of Union Address Discussed

AU3001143592 Munich SUEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG
in German 30 Jan 92 p 4

[Editorial by Josef Joffe: "Bush Has Woken Up"]

[Text] One year ago, George Bush had reached the highest popularity rating—an apparently unshakable approval rating of 93 percent. Now, at the very time when Bush had to give his State of the Union Address, 73 percent of the citizens polled say that the nation is worse off than it was five years ago, and 60 percent believe that the opposition should be given a chance now. Putting it in more simplistic terms, party politician Bush, who is running for reelection in November this year, is up to his neck in difficulties. [passage omitted]

That is why Bush finally acted by giving his State of the Union Address on 28 January—19 months after the outbreak of the upswing and possibly a year too late. [passage omitted]

But the deficit, higher than at Reagan's "best" times, will not decrease as a result. That is why Bush is planning to cut back several billion dollars on arms spending. This topic had a prominent place in his speech. These cuts will amount to \$50 billion during the next five years. For instance, only 20 instead of the envisaged 75 B-2 long-range bombers will be built, and the existing MX inter-continental missiles will be abolished while new Midg-etman missiles will not be procured.

That, too, makes sense because in his speech on 29 January, Boris Yeltsin also promised to considerably decrease the Soviet arsenal. Thus about 3,500 strategic warheads could be eliminated on both sides. Given the actual number (United States 9,000; Commonwealth of Independent States 11,000), this is something that they can very well live with. What is more important than the figures, however, (which are of nuclear-ideological interest) is both countries' willingness to give up a decades-long practice where both of them had their fingers on the trigger around the clock. To continue the analogy, they must take their fingers away, and instead

they must put on a safety lever, preventing a slaughter from being touched off by a false radar signal or sheer nervousness. Yeltsin's proposal to scrap "satellite killers" is also very good because whoever is unable to keep track of the other in a crisis tends to panic.

It may be that owing to such a cooperative approach on international and disarmament policy, Bush can present himself to the electorate as an indispensable statesman once again. However, following the victory in the cold war that Bush celebrated extensively in his speech, he cannot make such a great show with foreign policy any more. The United States does not feel threatened any more, and elsewhere—in Middle East diplomacy—it will not be possible to bring in the harvest soon. Conversely, the Democrats can shake off their worst handicap since Carter's times: the voters' conviction that the Democrats are unreliable when and if the nation must demonstrate strength and assertiveness. The electorate's mood has had a "social democratic" touch recently. A total of 75 percent want the state to do more for employment and education. Bush must pray that his economic program will hold out prospects of a new spring in the fall.

UNITED KINGDOM

Third World Threat Said to Necessitate Trident

92WC0030A London THE DAILY TELEGRAPH
in English 11 Jan 92 p 12

[Editorial—"Fresh Nuclear Threat"]

[Text] The American Defence Secretary, Mr. Dick Cheney, has given a blunt warning that a growing number of countries in the Third World may acquire weapons of mass destruction in the coming years as a result of the collapse of the Soviet Union. His chief worry is that Soviet nuclear scientists, many of whom are demoralised and poorly paid, will offer their services as mercenaries to the highest bidder.

It will not be easy for the West to keep tabs on these nuclear experts. According to the Kurchatov Institute of Atomic Energy, there are 5,000 teams of scientists capable of making nuclear weapons in Moscow alone. Even if their identities were known, which they are not, it would be impossible to track so many individuals across the globe. Some have already emigrated and are working on peaceful research in laboratories in America, Japan and Europe. We hope that more will join them. But the research facilities of the West cannot absorb such a huge number of nuclear physicists. Many will fail to get posts, and will find themselves striving for a livelihood in the impoverished republics. There is a real danger that some will sell themselves to the highest overseas bidder.

Mr. Cheney is less concerned that the Soviet nuclear arsenal will start to leak on to the international black market. Strategic weapons are under firm central control, guarded by elite Spetsnaz forces. It remains unclear whether tactical and chemical weapons are still in safe hands. All that the West can usefully do is to offer to help

the central authorities dismantle unwanted nuclear weaponry as quickly as possible.

Yet, whatever we do to control proliferation of nuclear and chemical technology, there is no doubt about the increasing risk that unstable regimes, hostile to Western civilisation, will acquire ballistic missiles that can reach European cities. Several countries are not far short of this capability. Libya, for instance, has Chinese missiles that could strike Italy. Arms experts predict that the range of these missiles will increase, with a growing number of countries able to deliver chemical and, eventually, nuclear warheads. This could put the population of London at the mercy of a maverick regime.

As long as the nuclear threat stemmed solely from the superpower confrontation, it was understandable that the West chose to defend itself by a policy of deterrence, because no anti-missile defence looked convincing against massed attack. But nuclear proliferation will bring a threat from small numbers of relatively unsophisticated nuclear weapons, in the hands of tyrants such as Saddam Hussein. It is likely that the West will have to rethink its entire defence strategy, giving increased emphasis to anti-missile defence. The technology to shoot down incoming missiles is evolving rapidly, particularly in the United States.

Britain has been left behind in this field. There seems a growing case for the Government to review its strategic priorities, diverting resources towards the research and development of ballistic missile defence. It would be foolish to pretend that there are any cheap options. We cannot be certain about the strategic picture in the next generation. But we can at least make policy on the presumption that low-level nuclear attack by some alien madman is likely to represent a greater threat to this country than massive missile assault from the former Soviet republics. In this new environment, Trident may seem increasingly irrelevant.

Russia's Yeltsin, Prime Minister Major Meet

Yeltsin Arrives

LD3001102292 London PRESS ASSOCIATION
in English 0942 GMT 30 Jan 92

[Report by Teilo Colley, PRESS ASSOCIATION]

[Excerpt] Russian President Boris Yeltsin arrived at London's Heathrow Airport today for the first face-to-face talks with Prime Minister John Major since the collapse of the Soviet Union.

A tanned and fit looking Mr Yeltsin said recent nuclear arms reductions announced in Washington and Moscow were separate to the issue of Britain's nuclear forces.

But he added: "Of course we shall be calling on the other nuclear powers, Great Britain, China and France, to follow suit."

Chancellor Norman Lamont greeted Mr Yeltsin as he stepped on to the red carpet at Heathrow's VIP terminal after his plane from Moscow touched down at 9.20am. Mr Yeltsin, buoyed by the historic nuclear arms cutback deal

with the United States, was meeting Mr Major at 10 Downing Street where he is expected to explain the fine print of his agreement to match President Bush's offer to slash his nuclear armoury.

In addition, he has confirmed that Russian-controlled nuclear missiles will no longer be targeted on U.S. cities. In an interview on BBC 2's Newsnight last night, Mr Yeltsin told interviewer David Dimbleby: "We don't want to consider the United Kingdom a potential enemy again."

During today's talks the two men will sign a 10-point declaration setting out commitments on military and economic cooperation. [passage omitted]

Discusses Nuclear Reductions

LD3001123992 London PRESS ASSOCIATION
in English 1102 GMT 30 Jan 92

[Report by PRESS ASSOCIATION correspondents Sarah Womack and Teilo Colley]

[Excerpts] A beaming President Boris Yeltsin and his wife were greeted on the steps of 10 Downing Street today by John and Norma Major before a session of talks. It will be the two politicians' first face to face discussions since the Soviet Union's collapse and the resignation of Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev. [passage omitted]

Mr Major and Mr Yeltsin began their talks in the Cabinet Room. The question of British assistance to Russia's stricken economy through the various multi-million pound know-how funds was the dominant theme at first. These include a medical assistance package and a training initiative already announced. There is also a plan to place 1,000 employees with British finance, insurance and legal firms.

Mr Yeltsin was told there was not much scope for jobs in Britain for Russian nuclear trained personnel. But there is a plan to try to get them working in their own country on dismantling the arms. The prime minister will resist any calls from Mr Yeltsin for Britain to reduce her own nuclear armoury. Mr Major will repeat that Britain is operating on a minimum nuclear deterrent which will be a fraction of the weaponry in Russia and the US even after the cuts have been carried out. The meeting was developing later into a plenary session in which Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd, Mr Lamont, Defence Secretary Tom King, Agriculture Minister John Gummer, Trade and Industry Secretary Peter Lilley and their Russian counterparts will take part. They were later being joined by Mrs Major and Mrs Yeltsin for lunch.

Sign Joint Declaration

LD3001143192 London PRESS ASSOCIATION
in English 1355 GMT 30 Jan 92

[Report by PRESS ASSOCIATION lobby correspondent Paul Bromley]

[Text] The prime minister and Russian President Boris Yeltsin today agreed to work together "for the reduction of forces and armaments." A joint declaration signed by

the leaders after Downing Street talks said Britain and Russia would examine the potential for co-operation "in the destruction and safe disposal of surplus weapons in Russia." The declaration, called Partnership in the Nineties, said both countries were "opening a new page in their relations" and had left the cold war period behind.

The 15-point document said the two countries "intend to undertake all steps necessary to ensure that nuclear weapons, and all other weapons of mass destruction, are held at all times under secure control." It added: "They believe that any proliferation of weapons of mass destruction carries serious risks for international peace and security." Britain and Russia reaffirmed their strong commitment to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention. They agreed to remain "in active consultation on these questions and will also examine the potential for British/Russian cooperation in the destruction and safe disposal of surplus weapons in Russia."

The document continued: "The United Kingdom and the Russian Federation will take steps to prevent the transfer to other countries of technology and expert knowledge which could contribute to the development of nuclear armaments and of other types of weapon of mass destruction." The two countries also said they would work together to "consolidate and carry forward agreements for the reduction of forces and armaments." They looked forward to the "very early" ratification and implementation of the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty as well as the Start agreement and other measures to reduce nuclear weapons.

The joint declaration, covering a wide range of issues, said the UK and Russia were "opening a new page in their relations." It added: "They have left behind the period of the cold war, do not threaten each other's national interests and are committed to universal democratic principles and aspirations." The document said there were no ideological barriers and no political impediments to the growth of friendship and mutual understanding between the British and Russian peoples.

The deal was signed during the two politicians' first face-to-face discussions since the Soviet Union's collapse and the resignation of Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev. Mr Yeltsin, accompanied by his wife Naya, had touched down at Heathrow for a morning of talks before crossing the Atlantic for tomorrow's special session of the United Nations' Security Council in New York. With a broad smile, he waved to waiting cameramen and reporters in Downing Street and greeted Mr Major with a warm handshake. Mr Major replied: "How nice to see you."

Mr Yeltsin's wife, Naya, joined Mrs Norma Major for a sight-seeing trip round London. It was her first trip to Britain and she said: "It is wonderful."

Russia is to set up a consulate-general in Edinburgh, it was announced today. A memorandum of understanding signed between Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd and Russian ambassador Boris Pankin set out plans for new diplomatic representation. Britain is to open a consulate-general in St Petersburg "very soon".

Missiles No Longer Target UK

LD3001175292 London PRESS ASSOCIATION
in English 1627 GMT 30 Jan 92

[Report by PRESS ASSOCIATION correspondent Sarah Womack]

[Text] Russian nuclear missiles will no longer be targeted at Britain...despite the Government's determination to go-ahead with the Trident programme. Russian President Boris Yeltsin made this historic announcement on the steps of No 10 Downing Street today after talks with Prime Minister John Major.

"In the past the United States, United Kingdom and Europe in general were regarded as our potential enemy. That doctrine has to be changed and the missiles retargeted. The missiles that will remain after the cuts and destruction will be used only as a deterrent."

Mr. Major said he had earlier reassured President Yeltsin over the size of Britain's nuclear deterrent and told him it was "only a minimum nuclear strategic force threatening no one."

It had been suggested that Mr. Yeltsin would put pressure on Britain during his visit to reduce its nuclear deterrent, since Britain is planning to replace Polaris, with its 192 warheads, with four Trident submarines capable of carrying 512 warheads. But on the steps of No 10 President Yeltsin stressed only the cuts he had announced himself in Russia's strategic and tactical nuclear weapons.

A hotline telephone link will also be set up linking Mr. Major and Mr. Yeltsin's office, the Prime Minister revealed. It would not be "crisis line" but would reflect growing number of shared interests. The prime minister said Britain will make available 280 million pounds in medium term export credit cover and investment insurance to Russia and the other republics.

Mr. Major said "new progress in building a new relationship" between Russia and Britain had been made. It was also disclosed President Yeltsin will visit Britain again sometime this year and Mr Major would fly to Russia in the second half of the year.

President Yeltsin, stressing the importance of economic reform in Russia, said: "Russia has shaken off the Communist shackles and embarked on a civilised road of development." The economic reform now taking place was five years overdue and he appreciated the difficulties caused by price liberalisation on the poor. But Russia was a great country and would survive "all small storms and smaller earthquakes." He said general unrest would impede progress should the reforms fail, and Russia faced the danger then of falling into an "abyss."

Mr. Major said: "Today we have made new progress in building a new relationship between our two countries. We have always had shared interests. Now we have shared values as well—of democracy, a free economy and a commitment to peace and to stability." Welcoming superpower arms reductions, Mr. Major said: "I expressed our very strong support for further moves

towards deterrents at lower levels. I also assured President Yeltsin of our intention to maintain only a minimum nuclear strategic force threatening no one."

Mr. Yeltsin and Mr. Major left Heathrow for New York within five minutes of each other. Neither made any comment before boarding their aircraft.

Major Delivers UN Security Council Statement

LD3101092692 London PRESS ASSOCIATION
in English 0830 GMT 31 Jan 92

[Excerpts] John Major was today delivering his presidential speech to the first United Nations Security Council summit. The text of the final declaration was expected to be approved by 15 world leaders at the summit in New York, REUTERS said.

The full text of Mr. Major's statement is: "The members of the Security Council have authorised me to make the following statement on their behalf. The Security Council met at the headquarters of the United Nations in New York on January 31, 1992, for the first time at the level of heads of state and government. The members of the council considered, within the framework of their commitment to the United Nations Charter, 'The responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security'. The members of the Security Council consider that their meeting is a timely recognition of the fact that there are new, favourable international circumstances under which the Security Council has begun to fulfill more effectively its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security."

Time of Change

"This meeting takes place at a time of momentous change. The ending of the Cold War has raised hopes for a safer, more equitable and more humane world. Rapid progress has been made in many regions of the world towards democracy and responsive forms of government, as well as towards achieving the purposes set out in the charter. [passage omitted]

Disarmament, Arms Control, and Weapons of Mass Destruction

"The members of the council, while fully conscious of the responsibilities of other organs of the United Nations in the fields of disarmament, arms control, and non-proliferation, reaffirm the crucial contribution which progress in these areas can make to the maintenance of international peace and security. They express their commitment to take concrete steps to enhance the effectiveness of the United Nations in these areas.

"The members of the council underline the need for all member states to fulfill their obligations in relation to arms control and disarmament; to prevent the proliferation in all its aspects of all weapons of mass destruction; to avoid excessive and destabilising accumulations and transfers of arms; and to resolve peacefully in accordance with the charter any problems concerning these matters threatening or disrupting the maintenance of regional and global stability.

"They emphasise the importance of the early ratification and implementation by states concerned of all international and regional arms control arrangements, especially the START and CFE treaties. The proliferation of all weapons of mass destruction constitutes a threat to international peace and security.

"The members of the council commit themselves to working to prevent the spread of technology related to the research for or production of such weapons and to take appropriate action to that end.

"On nuclear proliferation, they note the importance of the decision of many countries to adhere to the non-proliferation treaty and emphasise the integral role in the implementation of that treaty of fully effective IAEA [International Atomic Energy Agency] safeguards, as well as the importance of effective exports controls. The members of the council will take appropriate measures in the case of any violations notified to them by the IAEA.

"On chemical weapons, they support the efforts of the Geneva Conference with a view to reaching agreement on the conclusion, by the end of 1992, of a universal convention, including a verification regime, to prohibit chemical weapons.

"On conventional armaments, they note the General Assembly's vote in favour of a United Nations register of arms transfers as a first step, and in this connection recognise the importance of all states providing all the information called for in the General Assembly's resolution.

"In conclusion, the members of the Security Council affirm their determination to build on the initiative of their meeting in order to secure positive advances in promoting international peace and security. They agree that the United Nations secretary general has a crucial role to play. The members of the council express their deep appreciation to the outgoing secretary general, His Excellency Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, for his outstanding contribution to the work of the United Nations, culminating in the signature of the El Salvador peace agreement. They welcome the new secretary general, His Excellency Dr. Butrus Ghali, and note with satisfaction his intention to strengthen and improve the functioning of the United Nations. They pledge their full support to him, and undertake to work closely with him and his staff in fulfilment of their shared objectives, including a more efficient and effective United Nations system.

"The members of the council agree that the world now has the best chance of achieving international peace and security since the foundation of the United Nations. They undertake to work, in their own efforts in close cooperation with other United Nations member states to achieve this, as well as to address urgently all the other problems, in particular those of economic and social development, requiring the collective response of the international community.

"They recognise that peace and prosperity are indivisible and that lasting peace and stability require effective international cooperation for the eradication of poverty and the promotion of a better life for all in larger freedom."

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

28 APRIL 1992